

MAR 1 1924

DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
{ Prof. W. M. CALDER, M.A., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.R.S., *Hon. Treasurer.* L. WHIBLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*
Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.* A. D. GODLEY, D.Litt., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.R.S. *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.* Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., Litt.D., F.R.S., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALL, University of Chicago;
Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;
Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol XXXVIII FEBRUARY-MARCH, 1924 Nos. 1, 2

CONTENTS

	PAGE	REVIEWS (continued)	PAGE
EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS	1	<i>Rhetorica of Philodemus</i> (Hubbell), <i>Philodemus über die Gedächtnis</i> , V. (Jensen), J. L. STOKES	31
'ON THE KNEES OF THE GODS' R. B. ONIANS	2	<i>Poine</i> (Trenton), H. J. ROSE	33
THUCYDIDES AND THE GREEN WALL AT TROY. D. S. ROBERTSON	7	<i>Lactantius</i> (Diels), J. D. DUFF	33
THE GREEK FOR A GOLDFINCH. D'ARCY W. THOMPSON	7	<i>Roman Politics</i> (Abbott); <i>Greek Life and Thought</i> (Van Hook), W. R. HALLIDAY	36
REHETORICA AD ALEXANDRUM, C. 30. W. RHYS ROBERTS	11	<i>Macrobius</i> (Whittaker), A. D. NOCK	37
SOME EMBELLISHMENTS IN ISAEUS. W. WYSE	12	<i>Our Hellenic Heritage</i> (James), J. A. K. THOMPSON	38
ATAKTA. A. C. PEARSON	13	<i>L'Ordre des Mots dans la Phrase latine</i> (Marrouzeau), H. J. ROSE	39
It Bello Tessera Signum. H. J. THOMPSON	14	<i>Roman Literature</i> (Fowler), J. WIGHT DUFF	40
ORTHAGORISCHUS. W. R. HALLIDAY	15	<i>Antike Gewächsmurmen</i> (Vredebaant), C. T. SELTMAN	41
DION CHRYSOSTOM, OR. XII. 44. A. S. FRIGUSON	15	<i>Index Verborum C. Suetonii Tranquilli</i> (Howard and Jackson), J. S. PHILLIMORE	42
REVIEWS		<i>Eusebius Pamphili Chronica Canones</i> (Fotheringham), A. SOUTER	42
<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> , Vol. I. A. W. GOMME	16	<i>Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei</i> (Turner), A. SOUTER	43
<i>Inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure</i> (Gégoire), Fasc. I. W. H. BUCKLES	19	<i>Euripidis Hystipylia</i> (Italien), E. LORKE	43
<i>Origines indo-européennes des Mots grecs</i> (Meillet), ARTHUR PLATT	20	<i>Palaeografia Latina</i> (Barone), E. H. MINNS	44
TACITUS, <i>Agriicola</i> (Anderson), R. G. COLLINGWOOD and E. HARRISON	22	<i>The Claim of Antiquity</i> , T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS	44
Aristophanes' <i>Frogs</i> (Radermacher), F. W. HALL	24	<i>Sketches from a Library Window</i> (Anderson), J. A. K. THOMPSON	44
<i>Caecilius</i> (Merrill), A. E. HOUSMAN	25	<i>The Pyrrhic Accent and Rhythm of Latin and Keltic</i> (Fitzhugh), J. FRASER	45
<i>Die Briefe Platons</i> (Howald), J. BURNET	27	<i>The Sacred Dance</i> (Oesterley), W. R. HALLIDAY	45
<i>Licht vom Osten</i> (Lissmann), <i>Litterae cristianae</i> (Ghedini); <i>Form of Ancient Greek Latin</i> (Exler), W. M. CALDER	29	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	45
		CORRESPONDENCE	47
		BOOKS RECEIVED	47

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Double Numbers, 3s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$2. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Prof. H. A. Ormerod, 46, Cliff Road, Hyde Park, Leeds; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford, and Mr. M. P. Charlesworth, St. John's College, Cambridge; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. E. W. V. Clifton, 26, Danesbury Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Miss F. M. Rees, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss P. K. Downes, Redland High School, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss C. E. Parker, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. W. E. Nash-Williams, University College, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss E. M. Watson, Central Girls' School, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Mr. J. Whatmough, University College, Bangor; Miss Buckley, Simon Langton School for Girls, Canterbury; Miss D. J. L. Poole, 19, Banbury Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 6, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. A. B. Jeffries, 100, Cedar Road, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; and Mr. C. W. Baty, 49, Waterloo Road, Bedford.

BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

86, CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2.

CLASSICAL BOOKS CRITICAL AND EARLY EDITIONS

Please ask for our Catalogue.

GALLOWAY & PORTER
UNIVERSITY BOOKSELLERS
CAMBRIDGE (ENG.)

Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope

A Chapter in the History of English

By

Henry Cecil Wyld

Author of "The Historical Study of the Mother
Tongue," "A Short History of English," "A
History of Modern Colloquial English," etc.

5s. NET.

This little book is intended primarily for those interested in the study of English literature, of which the problems connected with the Rhymes of the earlier poets form a not uninteresting, if subsidiary, study.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

W
T
de
F
ca
w
sh
hi
in
ac
de
we
if
in
lig
'M
V
H
E
qu
F.
on
J.
wa
St
on
tur
de
we
of
kin
on
bro
and
the
ma
not
thi
Ca
rou
pro
a le
larg
but
to
Lo
We
ton
the
tha

N

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY—MARCH, 1924

EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS

THE Classical Association met at Westminster School, on January 3 to 5. The special attraction was the Presidential address on 'The Classics in France,' which the Marquess of Crewe came over from Paris to deliver. It was scholarly and fascinating, and showed profound knowledge of French history and a sympathetic understanding of the French point of view. The address which Lord Finlay has recently delivered to the Scottish Association would form an excellent complement, if the two papers could be published in pamphlet form. Miss Skeel delighted her hearers by an account of 'Medieval Travellers to Rome.' Mr. Vernon Rendall illustrated the hold Horace has always had on the best English thought, by abundance of quotation and witty comment. Mr. F. E. Adcock gave a delightful paper on 'Greek Diplomacy,' and Professor J. A. K. Thomson on 'Greek Irony' was interesting and suggestive. Mr. Stanley Casson gave a lantern lecture on 'Recent Discoveries of Greek Sculpture.' The afternoon, devoted to recent developments in school teaching, was well spent. The President and Fellows of the Royal College of Physicians kindly gave a reception to the members on Thursday evening, at which they brought out all their treasures of books and plate. It was a privilege to see their collection of portraits. As Linacre may be regarded as their founder, nothing could be more appropriate than this visit. On Saturday afternoon, Canon Westlake kindly escorted a party round the Abbey and its buildings, and proved himself as ideal a guide as he is a lecturer. The attendance was not so large as on some previous occasions; but Mr. Herbert Fisher took the trouble to come and move a vote of thanks to Lord Crewe, and the Headmaster of Westminster was a kindly host. A tone of hopeful confidence characterised the whole proceedings. It was obvious that Dr. Mackail's visit to Australia

had borne fruit in reviving classical enthusiasm there. The same keenness is reported from New Zealand. The number of local branches in England and Wales has now risen to eighteen, and the veteran teacher Professor Postgate, who was enthusiastically elected President for 1924, will find that the Association, in the foundation of which he was the prime mover, is thriving and growing every year. It ought to be a point of honour with every classical teacher in the country to belong to it. United we stand; divided we fall. If the membership is doubled — it is now over 2,000 — our opinion can no longer be ignored.

All who saw the Cambridge *Oresteia* in 1921, and many who missed that production, will be interested to learn that the Cambridge Greek Play Committee is again at work. On the evenings of February 26, 27, 28, 29 and March 1, and on the afternoons of Thursday, February 28, and Saturday, March 1, the *Birds* of Aristophanes will be acted by members of the University in Greek, with Sir Hubert Parry's music. The costumes and scenery will be designed by Mr. Duncan Grant, the musical directors will be Dr. Charles Wood and Mr. Bernhard Ord, and the producers will be Mr. J. T. Sheppard and Mr. J. Burnaby, who were jointly responsible for the *Oresteia*. The acting edition, with a verse translation by Mr. Sheppard, will shortly be published by Bowes and Bowes (price 3s. 6d., English only 2s.). Reserved seats—Stalls and dress circle, 4s. 9d., 5s. 9d., 7s. 6d., and 10s. 6d., pit stalls, 3s. 6d.—can be booked by post. Letters, with remittances, should be addressed to the 'Box Office Manager, New Theatre, Cambridge,' and should reach the Theatre on or before Monday, February 18. Readers will do a service to the Committee if they will make this performance widely known.

'ON THE KNEES OF THE GODS.'

Ταῦτα θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται (Homer, *Il.* XVII. 514, XX. 435; *Od.* I. 267, 400, XVI. 129)—'It lies on the knees of the gods.' This famous phrase, still current, is a picturesque way of saying that the future of some issue rests with a higher power whose will is not yet known. While this, its general significance, is clear, its origin is lapped in obscurity. Ancient scholiasts and modern scholars alike have failed to give any satisfactory answer to the question: 'What mental image must be reconstructed to explain why the gods' knees are mentioned?' The ancients were content to offer various equally inconclusive interpretations, and the moderns do little more than hesitatingly to defend one or other of these. There is usually a 'perhaps' in their suggestions, and the best they can do is to show the futility of rival theories. Whatever their choice, their method, as also that of the scholiasts, has been almost uniformly the same—namely, to seek the truth in one or other of the various explicit uses of γούνατα in Homer, as symbols of strength, as clasped in supplication, or as the lap of the god whereon gifts were dedicated. There is none other which could conceivably apply; and, apart from slight modifications of the above, there remain only two other suggestions—one that of a scholiast, which for its apparent nonsense has been ignored; and the other, that hesitatingly supported by Merry and Riddell (note to *Od.* I. 267) on the basis of a παροιμία, which runs: πέντε κριτῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται. It is sufficient to read their applications of the latter and to examine the paroemiographer's explanation: παροιμῶδες, ὅσον ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ ἐξουσία εἰσίν. εἴρηται δὲ ἡ παροιμία παρόσον πέντε κριταὶ τοὺς κομικοὺς ἔκρινον, ὥς φησιν Ἐπίχαρμος. σύγκειται οὖν παρὰ τὸ Ὀμηρικόν, θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται, ἐπεὶ οἱ κριταὶ ἐν τοῖς γόνασιν εἶχον ἃ νῦν εἰς γραμματεῖα γράφεται (Zenobius III. 64). If this phrase originated with reference to the five judges of competitions in comedy, possibly in the mind of Epicharmus himself (*vide* fr. 229, Kaibel), it would seem to be later than Homer, while in

any case the paroemiographer's explanation shows that he is only groping after a meaning, and can but take refuge in vagueness. His last clauses will scarcely bear analysis. It appears that instead of explaining, this phrase is rather derivative from the Homeric figure, and presupposes it, being a natural parody to suit a particular issue.

There is another way of attack, apparently as yet untried—namely, to examine the forms under which the Homeric Greek conceived the gods as controlling the fortunes of men. Direct personal relations, in which the god commands, inspires, or blinds a man, are clearly not in point. Some mode of conceiving divine causation in general is required. Μοῖρα and Αἶσα are usually not spoken of in direct relationship with the gods, and where they are they do not appear to throw any light on the present question. In one passage indeed (*Il.* XXIV. 527) Zeus is described as mixing the lives of men from jars on or in the ground, but that does not help. There remains only one other expression, with several kindred phrases that may be considered later. It is ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοί, which with slight modifications occurs eight times in Homer: *Il.* XXIV. 525; *Od.* I. 17, III. 208, IV. 208, VIII. 579, XI. 139, XVI. 64, XX. 196. Thus in *Od.* I. 16 the poet describes how Calypso detained Odysseus:

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔτος ἦλθε περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν
τῷ οἱ ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι
εἰς Ἰθάκην, οὐδ' ἐνθα πεφυγμένος ἦεν ἀέθλων.

It is the same image that is used of Μοῖρα and Αἶσα, an image which seems to dominate ancient thought in the expression of divine causation. Here on *a priori* grounds the seeker might expect to find the explanation of a phrase, the only certain meaning of which is that the determination of the future rests with the gods.

What is the process of spinning? The details of method in any particular age of Greece are by no means clear, and for the Homeric and earlier ages there is virtually no direct evidence. Only thus much is clear, that it was usually done sitting, since so almost

always Homer describes the spinners (e.g. *Od.* XVII. 97). Under such conditions there are certain essential details which may be accepted from general practice elsewhere. From wool held in or passed over the raised left hand a wisp is drawn down by the right and fastened to the spindle, which is then spun by the fingers of the same hand. When a certain amount had been drawn out the spindle would reach the knees, and when just above them could be most comfortably spun. If, however, the spinner desired, it might be allowed to pass over the right knee, the latter being perhaps slightly withdrawn, and the process continued until it reached the ground, when the amount just spun was wound round the spindle and its upper end fixed in the notch or hook of the latter to prevent its unwinding. The same process was then repeated. There are, however, variations and complications. Thus Kimakowicz¹ describes a primitive method of spinning together several threads: 'The spinner sits on a stool and holds in her raised left hand a spindle suspended from the yarn so as almost to touch the ground; the right hand then places the lower end of the spindle flat on the right leg above the knee, and with a sharp rub of the palm slides it off so as to give it a rapid and lasting rotation as it hangs.' That portion is then wound up and the process repeated. This may be the explanation of the bas-relief from the Forum of Nerva, illustrated under 'Fusus' in Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*. A similar method is shown in representations² of slave-women in ancient Egypt. One of the latter, standing, appears to have raised her right knee and to rotate the spindle between it and the flat of her right hand with a rolling motion like that last described. This or a kindred use is probably the purpose of the *ἐπίνητρον*, a tapering hemicylinder of wood or earthenware, with one end closed and rounded so as to fit over the bent knee. It is this, as

Blümner plausibly conjectures, which is shown in a defective vase-painting (*Techn. und Term.*, Fig. 41) on the right knee of a seated woman. On it she has the flat of her right hand; her left is raised as if holding wool or a distaff. Of this *ἐπίνητρον*, Pollux VII. 32 says: *ἐφ' οὗ δὲ νήθουσι ἢ νῶσι ἐπίνητρον καλεῖται καὶ ὄνος*. Similarly Hesychius: *ἐπίνητρον · ἐφ' ᾧ τὴν κρόκην τρίβουσιν*; and the *Et. Magn.* 262, 20: *ἐπίνητρον, τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν γονάτων ἐφ' οὗ τὴν κρόκην ἐνήθου*. *νήθειν* and *νέιν* are usually indistinguishable in meaning from *κλώθειν*, and seem to form at least a part of the spinning process (cf. *Od.* VII. 197, and IV. 208 *infra*)—possibly the rubbing of the wool thread between hand and knee to help the spinning and ensure smoothness, this when the spindle is already lower than the latter. Blümner (*ib.*, p. 119) thinks the *ἐπίνητρον* was used before and after the spindle, but does not face the possibility that it might be used with it. In any case, however, and whatever the method, it is plain that the knees play at least some part in the process of spinning.

There is further confirmation in a passage hitherto neglected by Homeric scholars—Plato's picture of 'Ανάγκη, in the whorls of whose spindle are set the stars and planets (*Rep.* X. 616c). Of this spindle he says, *στρέφεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς τῆς Ἀνάγκης γόνασιν* (617b), and it is with it that the *μοῖρα* of each soul about to be born is made valid by the spinning (*ἐπικλώθειν*) of the *Μοῖραι*, *Κλωθώ* and 'Ατροπος. Of the latter the word used is *νήσις* (620e). Such adaptation of Homer is completely in the Platonic manner, and it becomes almost certainly deliberate when we compare such lines as *Od.* VII. 197

πέισται ἄσσα οἱ Αἴσα κατὰ κλώθες τε βαρεῖαι
γενομένην νήσαντο λίνω δτε μιν τέκε μήτηρ

and IV. 208

ρεῖα δ' ἀργυρῶτος γόνος ἀνέρος ᾧ τε Κρονίων
ἔλβον ἐπικλώσῃ γαμέοντι τε γενομένην τε.

For *νήσαντο* in the first of these *ἐπένησε* is twice used in similar contexts of the *Iliad* (XX. 128, XXIV. 210) with *Αἴσα* and *Μοῖρα* respectively; but in Homer

¹ *Spinn- und Webwerkzeuge, Entwicklung und Anwendung in vorgeschichtlicher Zeit Europas*, Würzburg, 1910, p. 61.

² *Vide* Sir G. Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, ed. Birch, 1878, Vol. I., p. 378, Fig. 8, from the wall-paintings of Beni Hassan.

it is with the gods rather than either of these last that the verbs ἐπικλωθεῖν, etc., are most frequently used. Here, then, Plato would seem to be following him, save that he has substituted the Pythagorean Ἀνάγκη for the gods or Μοῖρα, retaining only the latter as helping to spin. It seems just to infer that this was his interpretation of the phrase θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κείται—one which, perhaps as traditional, he expected to be recognised and to add authority to his myth. This is made the more likely in that he uses the word ἡλακότη for the shaft of the spindle, whereas its ordinary meaning was 'distaff,' an article which he does not mention. Adam and others, after Proclus, are driven to explain this as a verbal play on ἐηλάσθαι, but that, though it might supervene, can by no means explain the perversion. Homer too, however, like Plato, seems to mention only one instrument of spinning besides the τάλαρος, and that the ἡλακότη, which, despite Blümner and the general consensus of translators and commentators, means not 'distaff,' but 'spindle' (*vide infra*). This also would make it appear as if there were a tradition, and Plato were trying to be archaeologically exact.

This same passage of the *Republic* contains what may possibly be an alternative explanation of the phrase, drawn either from a rival tradition or from Plato's own thought. It is that of 'lots,' which, without the evidence of this passage before them, modern scholars have mentioned only to reject. A few lines after saying of the spindle στρέφεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς τῆς Ἀνάγκης γόνασιν (617b), Plato proceeds with the pilgrimage of the soul: Σφᾶς οὖν ἐπειδὴ ἀφικέσθαι, εὐθύς δὲ ἰέναι πρὸς τὴν Λάχεσιν. προφήτην οὖν τινὰ σφᾶς πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τάξει διαστήσαι, ἔπειτα λαβόντα ἐκ τῶν τῆς Λαχέσεως γονάτων κλήρους τε καὶ βίον παραδείγματα . . . εἰπεῖν . . . ψυχαὶ ἐφήμεροι, ἀρχὴ ἄλλης περιόδου θνητοῦ γένους θανατηφόρου. οὐχ ὑμᾶς δαίμων λήξεται ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς δαίμονα αἰρήσεσθε. πρῶτος δ' ὁ λαχὼν πρῶτος αἰρείσθω βίον ᾧ συνέσται ἐξ ἀνάγκης . . . ταῦτα εἰπόντα ῥίψαι ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς κλήρους. This prenatal allotment is in some degree parallel to *Il.* XXIII. 78 :

ἐμὲ μὲν κῆρ
ἀμφέχευε στυγερή, ἥ περ λάχε γιγνόμενόν περ.

(In Plato the responsibility is fixed on the soul in order to exculpate the Fates.) This, however, appears to be the only instance of such a conception in Homer, and even so it is not brought into any relation with the gods. The δαίμων, guardian spirit of life, is by no means the same as the κῆρ στυγερή which seizes at death. Further, λαβόντα ἐκ τῶν γονάτων is not so near to ἐν γούνασι κείται as στρέφεσθαι ἐν τοῖς γόνασιν. It may be no more than a mere coincidence of expression while the phrase was still running in his head. At all events, if it be a rival explanation, it is not nearly so satisfactory. In Homer lots are never connected with the knees. They are usually shaken in a helmet. Finally, the metaphor simply does not hold, since on Plato's own description, even before the souls emerge into life, it is untrue to say of the lots, ταῦτα θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κείται. This is not so of thread and spindle. Commenting on Plato, Adam says: 'ἐν τοῖς τῆς Ἀνάγκης γόνασι is an echo of ταῦτα θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κείται.' If, however, what goes before holds, it is no mere echo of phrase but the true explanation.

At this point we may return to the apparently foolish scholion mentioned above. It is the Schol. P. to *Od.* I. 267 and 400, and it runs thus: θεῶν ἐν γούνασι. ταῖς τῶν ἀστέρων κινήσεσιν ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν γονάτων. ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς τῶν ἀστέρων κινήσεως γίνονται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ εἰμαρμένα. For this there is of course absolutely no foundation in Homer. For him the stars have nothing whatever to do with Fate, and are not brought into relation with the gods. The scholiast himself, indeed, was probably acquainted with the underlying assumption of astrology, but such a fanciful comparison of knees and stars, with no middle term, is unthinkable. Hence the suggestion has been ignored as unworthy of consideration. Let us turn to Plato, however. It is strange that Adam (note to 616 c 17) and other commentators, while stressing the irreconcilability of the two conceptions, the spindle of Necessity and the shaft of light, which is the axis of the re-

volving heavens, yet fail to observe his reason for the union and its wonderful fitness despite discrepancies of detail. It is Plato's genius thus to fuse in a single image the astrological notions of the East and the early Hellenic idea of fate as spun. Here indeed we have a convenient middle term for the scholiast, one which, coming fresh from the glowing mind of Plato in such a myth, is indeed easily understood, but which, if omitted in a rather matter-of-fact and discontinuous commentary on Homer, leaves the two extremes incongruous and foreign to each other. It appears not unlikely that the Alexandrian critics had seen the connexion between the Homeric phrase and Plato's spindle of the starry heaven moving on the knees of Necessity, but that in the process of tradition the middle term or image combining them was forgotten, so that the scholiast, true to the tradition as far as he knows it, is driven to invent one for himself, very curiously indeed, in the common motion of knees and stars.

Similar evidence awaits us in Proclus' commentary on the *Republic* (ed. Kroll, p. 227). There he definitely associates the two phrases *ταῦτα θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κείται* and *στρέφειν δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς τῆς Ἀνάγκης γόνασιν*, but in both explains *γόνατα* as *σύμβολα κινητικῶν παρὰ τοῖς θεοῖς δυνάμεων*. This can be refuted by a reference to Plato alone, where it is plain that the knees have nothing whatever to do with the *motion* of the spindle. Indeed they could not, unless perhaps in some such connexion as that in which the *ἐπίνητρον* was used or that described by Kimakowicz. To this perversion Proclus may have been led by the same scholia—not those just mentioned—which mislead modern commentators, and also by his theory of *Ἀνάγκη*, in support of which it is introduced. At all events, it does not interfere with the essential fact that Proclus felt Plato to be adapting the phrase of Homer.

All this evidence, coherent and cumulative as it is, has probably escaped the notice of commentators because they looked only to Homer's explicit uses of the word *γούνατα*, and did not naturally connect the usually feminine operation

of spinning with the general plural *θεῶν*. The difficulty disappears when, instead, the mode of conceiving divine causation is studied, and the more numerous passages remembered where *ἐπικλώθειν* is used with *θεοί*, *δαίμων*, and *Κρόνιον*. As a possible though unnecessary confirmation, and for its own interest, there may be mentioned here a lemma of Steph. Byz. *περὶ πόλεων*, to which my attention was called by Mr. A. B. Cook. It runs thus: *Ἡλακάταιον, ὄρος Θεσσαλίας, ὅπου καὶ Διὸς Ἡλακαταίου ἱερόν. τὸ ἔθνικόν Ἡλακαταίεός· καὶ Ζεὺς Ἡλακατεὺς*. It has, I think, been hitherto assumed that Zeus derives his title from the place, the origin of whose name none seeks; but if we consider the form *Ἡλακατεὺς*, it is exceedingly difficult to believe that it is derived from *Ἡλακάταιον*, and it seems far more natural to regard it as an original cult-title like *Μοιραγέτης*, *Πολιεύς*, *Εὐβουλεύς*, etc., from which, as occasionally elsewhere, the place receives its name. Artemis was called *χρυσήλακος* in a different sense (*Od.* IV. 122). The *Κρόνιον* who *ἐπικλώθει* (*vide supra Od.* IV. 208) might well be called *Ζεὺς Ἡλακατεὺς*. There is no need for evidence in Homer that spinning was ever done by men. Spinning and weaving can be traced back to the neolithic age and even earlier.¹ In the dim past, from which such a concept as this almost certainly comes, it may well be that the male ancestors of the Achaeans with the Egyptians of old (*vide Herod.* II. 35; *Soph. O.C.* 339) and some comparatively primitive peoples to-day partook in or even wholly performed the spinning. The shepherd of Trebichow mentioned below is no exception in this. The exchanged attributes of Hercules and Omphale in some representations, where the former has a spindle, are perhaps better explained differently (*vide Daremberg-Saglio*, 'Fusus'). The internal evidence of Homer, however, is sufficient to show that his gods were habitually conceived as spinning what is to be.

Ἡλακότης.—In the various passages of Homer where spinning appears, there are only

¹ Schrader, *Reallexicon der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, 1901, pp. 791 and 939.

two instruments mentioned, *ἡλακάτην τάλαρόν τε* (*Od.* IV. 131), each always in the singular. The former alone is used as the symbol of spinning, as *ιστός* of weaving, and frequently occurs with this last to cover woman's sphere. Thus in *Il.* VI. 490 Hector bids Andromache not to be distressed for him:

ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰούσα τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμῃζε,
ἰστόν τ' ἡλακάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε
ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι.

The natural inference is that, apart from the *τάλαρος*, the *ἡλακάτη* is the essential, if not the only, instrument of spinning. What in actual fact is so? The distaff is a stick held in the left hand, under the left arm or in the girdle, and passing through the core of a ball of wool or yarn, from which a thread is drawn down and spun. It is merely a convenient means of holding or carrying the unspun wool and this, when the spinner is sitting, as in Homer, could instead quite well be passed from the knees or a basket (*τάλαρος*) over the raised left hand, or even wound round the arm (*vide* Blümner, *ib.*, Fig. 39). A. Götz describes an old shepherd of Trebi-chow who used to spin the wool for his stockings while tending his sheep, and who held the raw wool not on a distaff, but in his pocket, drawing thence the strand to be spun.¹ The real work of spinning is done by the fingers and spindle in one or other of the ways described above. While, therefore, it is quite possible to spin without a distaff, using perhaps, as the ancient Egyptians undoubtedly did, a basket instead,² it is utterly impossible to do so without a spindle, wheels and machines of later invention of course not being relevant. But Homer, apart from the *τάλαρος*, mentions only this one instrument, the *ἡλακάτη*. The conclusion would seem inevitable that *ἡλακάτη* means spindle. Blümner, however (*ib.*, p. 122), in harmony with all commentators and translators, cites Homer as an authority for the meaning 'distaff,' which the word undoubtedly possessed later.³ Against

this there are further considerations. In the very passage cited by Blümner (p. 120, note 2)—namely, *Od.* IV. 135—Helen is described as entering to spin with a *χρυσήν ἡλακάτην*, which with a *τάλαρος* had been given her in Egypt. Spindle and basket, as we have seen, were the Egyptians' utensils for spinning. That the *χρυσήν ἡλακάτην* was a spindle is also supported by Homer's description of Calypso as weaving *χρυσῇ κερκίδι* (*Od.* V. 62), since the *κερκίς* in Homer probably means 'spool,'⁴ and the spindle appears to have been used in that capacity. Hesychius, Suidas, and Photius define *πηνίον*, the later word for 'spool,' as *ἄτρακτος*, ἐν ᾗ εἰλείται ἡ κρόκη. Two pages later Blümner proceeds to explain that distaffs were usually made of reed, so that a particular kind of reed in time came to be called by the same name. This, the lightest of materials, is what we should expect, since usually it has to be held up by the left hand in a position of itself tiring enough. To make or use one of gold would be mere folly. For a spindle, on the other hand, weight is an advantage as keeping the thread taut and adding momentum to the rotation, so much so that Blümner (p. 124) gives as one of the uses of the whorl that it made the spindle heavier. On the archaeological side no metal distaffs, it appears, have been found as against numerous bronze spindles, not to speak of one of silver and another of wood covered with gold leaf (Blümner, pp. 124, 125). At Troy, Schliemann, discovering thousands of what are usually accepted as spindle-whorls, but no relic of a distaff, began to suspect what is here maintained.⁵ Were the distaffs of wood, they might be expected to perish with the wooden spindle-shafts; but, even so, charred fragments of a wooden spindle and two bone spindles, one broken, the other complete, have been found.⁶ Finally, there is the evidence of Plato quoted above,⁷ where, in reproducing an Homeric conception, he calls the shaft of Necessity's spindle *ἡλακάτην* and mentions no distaff. The shaft is the essential part of the spindle—indeed, the spindle itself—and the whorl an addition not always used. With the advent of the distaff and the arrow-shaped spindle, *ἄτρακτος*,⁸ its name *ἡλακάτη* might easily pass to the former, a shaft of larger size but similar form, and continue its old association only as a name for the shaft as opposed to the whorl. In any case this evidence, as against later usage, points uniformly to one conclusion—namely, that *ἡλακάτην*, in Homer at least, means 'spindle,' and that probably distaffs were not then used.

R. B. ONIANS.

¹ *Verhandl. der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie u.s.w.*, 1896, p. 473.

² See the pictures from Beni Hassan cited above. A similar method still in use among the peasants around Hermannstadt (Siebenbürgen) is described by Kimakowicz, pp. 61-63.

³ Apart from Homer, Blümner cites nothing earlier than the *Anth. Pal.*, save Eurip. *Orestes*, 1431, which he cites again (p. 227) as illustrating the use of *ελίσσειν* for the turning of the spindle. It runs: ἀδὲ λίνον ἡλακάτῃ | δακτύλοις ἔλισσε, | νῆμα δ' ἱερο πῆδῳ. If his meanings for *ελίσσειν* and *ἡλακάτῃ* are correct, it is difficult to see what kind of dative the latter can be. If, however, *ἡλακάτῃ* here also means spindle, the sense is simple, and we have another instance of the double instrumental dative, parallel to Sophocles, *Ajax*, 229: περιφαντος ἀνὴρ | θανέται, παραπλήκτῳ χερὶ συγκатаκτὰς | κελανοῖς ξίφεσιν βοτῶν καὶ βοτῆρας ἱππονώμας, where *χερὶ* corresponds to *δακτύλοις* and *ξίφεσι* to *ἡλακάτῃ*.

⁴ *Vide* Ling Roth, *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, 1916, p. 290.

⁵ *Troja*, Note XVI.

⁶ Dörpfeld, *Troja und Ilion*, pp. 390 and 400.

⁷ *Rep.* X. 616c.

⁸ Blümner, Figs. 48 and 53.

THUCYDIDES AND THE GREEK WALL AT TROY.

Thuc. I. 11. 1: ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀφικόμενοι μάχῃ ἐκράτησαν (δῆλον δέ· τὸ γὰρ ἔρυμα τῷ στρατοπέδῳ οὐκ ἂν ἔτειχίσαντο), φαίνονται δ' οὐδ' ἐνταῦθα πάσῃ τῇ δυνάμει χρησάμενοι κ.τ.λ.

THE inference in the parenthesis may have been obvious to Thucydides, but it is not obvious to us. Editors suppose the point to be this: *unless the Greeks had won a victory, the Trojans would have driven them into the sea*; but Thucydides could easily have said that in plain words. If this is his meaning, the stress laid upon the fortification of the camp is pointless.

So far from obvious is the inference, that many editors change ἐκράτησαν to ἐκρατήθησαν; the building of the wall then becomes proof of an initial defeat: the Greeks were forced to dig themselves in. This is easier, but not satisfactory. Neglect to fortify the camp might well be taken as a proof of initial victory; but fortification was in itself an obvious precaution, and no proof at all of an initial defeat.

These difficulties are serious enough, but matters become worse when we compare Thucydides with Homer. In the *Iliad* (VII. 337 ff. and 436 ff.) we are told that the wall round the camp was first built, on Nestor's advice, in the tenth year of the war. Thucydides' language obviously suggests that the wall was built soon after the Greeks landed.

This discrepancy has long been recognised, and many explanations have been offered. Classen accepted the scholiast's suggestion that Thucydides referred to an earlier wall, mentioned, thought Classen, in some lost epic; but the *Iliad* is clearly Thucydides' main authority, and this theory is unattractive. Another school, represented in England by Gilbert Murray, seizes on the passage as welcome proof that in Thucydides' *Iliad*, though the wall was mentioned, the occasion of its erection was not. This is a solution which, on

general grounds, I should be very unwilling to accept.

I wish to put forward¹ a simple emendation which makes Thucydides' parenthesis a logical inference from the *Iliad* as we have it. I suggest:

δῆλον δέ· τὸ γὰρ ἔρυμα τῷ στρατοπέδῳ οὐκ ἂν <ἔτει δεκάτῳ> ἔτειχίσαντο.

'That they did win a victory is obvious, for otherwise they would not have built the fortification round their camp in the tenth year of the war.'

This is a perfectly sound point. The building of the Greek wall was a confession that the offensive had passed to the Trojans; its postponement till the tenth year was (as Thucydides saw) a proof that up to then the offensive had lain with the Greeks.

Thucydides in the next sentence speaks of τὰ δέκα ἔτη, a phrase which would follow ἔτει δεκάτῳ very neatly.

The corruption which I postulate is an easy one, especially if we make the reasonable assumption that δεκάτῳ was written ι': <ἔτει ι> ἔτειχίσαντο.

It is generally agreed that several errors in the text of Thucydides are connected with the representation of numerals by letters of the alphabet. Among the more widely accepted corrections of this type may be mentioned: Krüger's τεσσάρων for δέκα in I. 57; Shilleto's ὀκτώ or Haacke's δέκα for τρία in II. 65; Ullrich's ἑπτὰ καὶ δέκα (ιζ') for ἐξ in V. 18; and Madvig's τριάκοντα for τρία in VIII. 29. Especially close to my proposal is Gertz's attractive correction of II. 34: λάρνακας κυπαρισσίνας ἄγουσιν ἄμαξαι <δέκα>, φυλῆς ἐκάστης μίαν.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

¹ Proposed by me at a meeting of the Cambridge Philological Society on November 8, 1923, and briefly published in *Cambridge University Reporter* of December 11, 1923, p. 382.

THE GREEK FOR A GOLDFINCH.

THE ancient names of beast and bird are seldom easy to interpret, and even when they seem easy may be very difficult. κυών and λέων are plain enough, but γαλή and ὕαινα are very hard words.

They are apt, moreover, to fall into little groups, where one mistake may lead us on into many blunders, or where one lucky clue may unravel one difficulty after another. To identify the

'Birds of Diomedea,' as I tried once to show (*Class. Rev.*, 1918, p. 92), is to throw light on a long row of hard words: αἶθνια, ἀνοπαῖα, καταρράκτης, κορώνη ἢ εἰνάλιος, ἐρωδιός, *ardea, mergus*. Such another little group is the string of names for the Goldfinch and its allies: ἀκανθίς, ἀκανθυλλίς, ἀστραγαλίνος, θραυπίς, ποικιλίς, σπίνος, χρυσομίτρης. Let us see what we can make of these.

Professor Delap, of the University of Indiana, has sent me an unedited fragment of Constantine Manasses, in which the Goldfinch is minutely and unmistakably described; it is the best description of a bird, I think, which I have read either in late or early Greek. It contains many interesting things which Professor Delap will deal with in his own way; the point for me is that the Byzantine Greek calls his bird ἀστραγαλίνος. We know the word already, but none too well. Dionysius (*de Avib.* III. 2) has the name, with the bare epithet ταχύς; the *Gloss. Philox.* gives us ἀστραγαλίνος, *cardelus*; and, lastly, Belon (*Obs.* I. ιι) gives it as one of the two Greek names for a Goldfinch in his day: 'Un Chardonneret, qui anciennement s'appelloit Pikilis, et en Latin Carduelis, est nommé Guardelli, ou bien Stragalino' (*cf.* Coray, *Art.* III.). We are all the better for a full confirmation by Constantine Manasses of the use and meaning of the word.

Dionysius includes in the same sentence σπῖνοι, καὶ τρυγόνες καὶ ἀστέρες, οἱς ἐρυθρός τε κύκλος ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ἀστήρ, ἐπὶ ταῖς κεφαλαῖς; and this red ring or circlet on the head points to the so-called ἀστήρ as no other bird than the Goldfinch. But the passage is not satisfactory, and may even be textually corrupt. τρυγόν, the Turtle-dove, looks out of place in a long list of small passerine birds; and these are all said to be caught with bird-lime: καὶ ἰξῶ μὲν αἰρούνται κτλ. This is true of the rest, but is unlikely to be true of the Turtle-dove, which is commonly caught in Southern Europe by a water-trap, like other pigeons. It seems to me just possible that ἀστήρ and τρυγόν have both been made out of ἀστραγαλίνος; but whether or no, ἀστήρ is not confirmed elsewhere, and seems to me doubtful here. I look then on ἀστραγα-

λίνος as a well-authenticated Goldfinch name, and on ἀστήρ as a doubtful one. In Giglioli's long catalogue of Italian bird-names there is no such word as ἀστραγαλίνος; where did this word come from, and what has become of it? I believe, and Otto Keller has made the suggestion before me (*Ant. Thierwelt*, II., p. 87), that it is the German *Stieglitz*, a Slavonic word found in Bohemian, Illyrian, etc., which has spread throughout Germany and even into the Scandinavian languages (Danish *Stillids*, etc.). It was a mere loan-word, then, in Greek; and while there is nothing 'star-like' in the colour or pattern of the Goldfinch's head, Dionysius's allusion to ἀστήρ perhaps points to the sort of *Volksetymologie* which brought the ρ into ἀστραγαλίνος.

Belon's 'Pikilis' is the ποικιλίς of Arist. *H.A.* IX. 609, the spurious Ninth Book. This passage only tells that ποικιλίς is hostile to κορυδῶν, πιπῶ, and χλωρεὺς—a scrap of folklore which we do not understand and which does not help us; but the Scholiast to Theocr. VII. 171 helps us a little: ἀκανθίς δὲ ὄρνεον ἐστὶ ποικίλον καὶ λιγυρόν—καλεῖται δὲ ποικιλίς διὰ τὴν χροίαν (*cf.* Coray, *Art.* II. s.v. γαρδέλι). The German *Buntfink*, which means a Chaffinch, is a parallel to ποικιλίς; but the Chaffinch (σπίζα) cannot well be meant here. The Goldfinch, commonest of Greek finches, is also the most variegated or particoloured of common birds; and Belon is doubtless right in attributing to it this epithet and name. But ποικιλίς was no deep-rooted or vernacular appellation; it again has left no trace in the Italian dialects, nor so far as we know in Modern Greek.

The same is true of χρυσομίτρης, which I take to be a poetic or literary word rather than a vernacular one. It is only mentioned in Arist. *H.A.* VIII. 592b, together with ἀκανθίς and θραυπίς, but we cannot doubt that it meant a Goldfinch. Gaza translates the word by *Aurivittis*, and we may leave it an open question whether he understood it or not; I rather suspect he was thinking of a golden headdress, a snood or fillet, as Stephanus also did: 'Forsan ex carduelium genere χρυσομίτρης nominatur, quae est capite aurei

coloris, et ueluti aurea mitra redimita.' But Aldrovandi (*Ornithol.* III., p. 800) saw clearly that *μίτρα* meant a belt or sash (cf. *μτροχίτων*, etc.), and that the Goldfinch was the bird with the golden patch upon his wings, which, when the wings are folded, makes a golden stripe or sash about his body.

We now come to *ἀκανθίς* and *ἀκανθυλλίς*, and to the cognate *ἀκαλανθίς*, *per metathesis facta*, as Aldrovandi says. The last of these three we have in *Ar. Av.* 871 (in *Pax* 1078 it seems to be a dog's name); also in a fragment of Nicander and in Suidas; in Latin as the true reading of all the MSS. (so Professor Lindsay assures me) in the third *Georgic* (V. 338); and in a similar verse by Paulinus of Nola (XXIII. 18), *nec nisi uere nouo resonant acalanthida dumi*. A form *acalantia* occurs in the glossaries, and Hesychius records a Laconian variant *ἀκαλανσίρ*. As to *ἀκανθίς* and *ἀκανθυλλίς* we may ask several questions. Were they one and the same bird or not? Was that bird the Goldfinch? Were either or both of these names used, either specifically or more generally, of other and closely related birds?

The evidence at hand is as follows. In form at least *ἀκανθίς* appears to be the precise equivalent of Lat. *carduelis*; it is, according to Aristotle (*H.A.* VIII. 592b), *ὄρνις ἀκανθοφάγος· ἐπὶ ἀκανθῶν νέμεται*, and from this Sundevall and Aubert and Wimmer have identified it with the Linnet. I see the Linnets everyday in winter-time among the whins, but the Greek surely means more than that: it means that the bird feeds on thistles, as the Goldfinch does and as its little cousins do. According to Ps. Arist. (*H.A.* IX. 17, 616b 30) it is *κακόβιος καὶ κακόχρους, φωνὴν μέντοι λεγυρὰν ἔχουσα*. What *κακόβιος* means, what fable or folklore may underlie it (if we can trust the reading at all), I do not know; but *κακόχρους* is plain enough, and it at once excludes the Goldfinch. The clear shrill note is referred to, not only by Aristotle, but also by Theocritus (VII. 141), and by Agathias in the *Anthology*, *λεγυρὸν βομβεῦσιν ἀκανθίδες*.

Of *ἀκανθυλλίς* we know little or nothing, save for the description of its

neat round nest in *H.A.* IX. 616a 5 (Plin. 10, 50, 1), which led Cuvier, Sundevall, Aubert, and Wimmer to identify it with one or other of those famous nest-builders, the Bearded or the Penduline Tit. But the Scholiast on Theocritus makes both *ἀκανθίς* and *ἀκανθυλλίς* synonymous with *ποικιλίς*, while the Philoxenus Glossary interprets both *ἀκανθυλλίς* and *ἀστραγαλῖνος* by *cardelus*; in any case they must be birds closely associated with the Goldfinch, while the two Tits are birds of remarkable appearance, totally different from the finches in look and habits. We have a few minor references: Pliny (X. 83, 4) calls *acanthis* 'avis minima,' and says that it lays twelve eggs—a statement which, if we could safely trust to it, might lead us back to the Tits. Servius (*ad G.* III. 338) has a note in which one word is remarkable: 'Acalanthis, quam alii lusciniā esse uolunt, alii uero carduelem, quae spinis et carduis pascitur; et inde etiam apud Graecos acalanthis dicta sit ab acanthis—i.e. spinis, quibus pascitur.' Probus has 'Acalanthis est ea quae Graeci dicitur *ἀκανθίς*, dicta est Latine carduelis a carduo. Alii lusciniā.' Other scholia are to the same effect: while Aldrovandi (*Ornithol.* ii. p. 798) says 'Sic passim Virgilii interpretes fere omnes, et sexcenti lexicorum authores pro Acanthide Carduelem interpretantur sicuti par Acalanthide, etc.'

We may take it, then, that all these feed on thistles and the like, that they are all good songsters, that they are related to, if not identical, with the Goldfinch, that one (at least) is known to build a very neat nest, and that one (at least) is said to be plain-coloured.

We have three closely related birds, three plain-coloured greenish cousins of the Goldfinch, all common in South Europe, in Italy and in Greece. These are the Siskin (*Chrysomitris spinus*), It. *lucarino* or *lugarino*; the Citril Finch (*Carduelis citrinella*), It. *verdolino*, *venturone*, etc.; and the Serin Finch (*Serinus hortulanus*), It. *verdolino* or *verzellino*. Of these the Citril Finch is a bird of the mountains—Aldrovandi knew it well in North Italy—and it is so like the Serin as to be often and easily mistaken for it. The Siskin is a common winter

migrant in Greece; and the Serin is a common bird there, and resident.

While all of these are more or less common cage-birds in Italy, the Siskin, or *lucarino*, is the commonest and cheapest. Aldrovandi so speaks of it—'ipse magno capitur numero, flocci etiam fere ab omnibus penditur, et vili admodum a nostris aucupibus pretio venundatur.' It is also the plainest-coloured, *κακόχροος*. In spite of the latter epithet Salmasius (*Ex. Plin.* 316a) insists that *ἄκανθίς* was the Goldfinch; but Gesner, Belon, and Aldrovandi, all take it without doubt to be the Siskin. Belon asserts that the latter was called in his time *σπινίδιον*. It may have been the Gk. *σπίνος*, a name which I applied, hesitatingly and wrongly, to the Chaffinch in my glossary. If that be so, and Aldrovandi debates the point at length, we should have the abundance and cheapness of the *Siskin* referred to in Aristophanes, *συνείρων τοὺς σπίνους πωλεῖ καθ' ἑπτά τούβολου*. Coray gives the Mod. Gk. *σκαθί* for the same bird, and explains its derivation from *ἄκανθίς* by comparing the change of *κάνθαρος* into *ἀσκάθαρος*.

These names may have been used somewhat vaguely or loosely in literature, but more particularly by the bird-catchers or bird-fanciers. It is likely enough that these men distinguished between *ἄκανθίς* and *ἄκανθυλλίς*, and the identification of *ἄκανθίς* with the Siskin would then leave *ἄκανθυλλίς* free for the Serin or the rarer Citril Finch. Now it is curious that *ἄκανθυλλίς* is the only one whose nest is described, and that the Siskin does not breed in Greece nor yet in Italy, while the Serin Finch does; the latter also is, by a little, the smaller bird. We may have some reason, then, to suppose that *ἄκανθυλλίς* meant, specifically, the Serin. Lastly, while Belon and Aldrovandi assign no Greek name to the Serin, for they neither of them distinguish between *ἄκανθίς* and *ἄκανθυλλίς*, Aldrovandi follows Belon in assigning the Gk. *θρανπίς* to the last of our three allied species, the Citril Finch. This, however, is no more than a conjecture.

Let us look again, and closer, at the modern names and their relation to the

ancient words. Thanks to Giglioli, we know the Italian vernacular bird-names better than those of any other country, our own included; but of modern Greek bird-names we know but little more than Belon told us more than three hundred years ago. There are one or two things to bear in mind. We run a risk, now and then, of taking a word to be vernacular when it is really artificial; for the old ornithologists and translators coined many a word which passed current afterwards. The Italian for a Siskin, as we have said, is *lucarino* or *lugarino*; but in the older books, such as Aldrovandi's, we find *ligorinus*, which Belon supposes to to have been coined by Gaza, *διὰ τὸ λιγυρὸν τῆς φωνῆς*. We must also remember not only that similar birds may pass under one and the same name in popular speech, but also that the same name may be used of very different birds in different places, just as to-day a heron in England is a 'crane' in Ireland.

The Goldfinch has three different names in Italy, in a host of dialectic forms. The chief is Cardellino, on which such changes are rung as Cardello, Cardillo, Cardenna, Cardlin, Gardlin, Ghiardelin, Ciardolinna, etc. This name has passed, like so many other Italian words, into Modern Greek, in such forms as *γαρδέλι*, *καρδέλι*, *γαρδελίνα*, *καρδελίνα*, *καρδερίνα* (Coray). We see that in all of these, both Italian and Greek, the *u* of the Latin *carduelis* has dropped out; but a form without the *u* is doubtless old. We have it in Petronius (fr. 46), *tres cardeles occidi*, and also in the Glossaries.

The second name is Scanzlin, Sganzzlin, Scalzarin, found chiefly in Northern Italy, in Parma, Modena, etc. It is not recorded from Naples or Sicily, where we should most expect to find a surviving Greek word; but nevertheless, I have little doubt that it is connected with *ἄκανθίς*, *ἄκανθυλλίς*, and *acalanthis*. In fact, when Vergil wrote *acalanthis dumi*, he may have got the word not far from home.

Somewhat similar names are given, also in North Italy, to the Serin—Sgarzolin, Sgarzerin, etc., and also to the Citril Finch, Sgarzolin verd; but

only a special student of Italian dialects could tell us whether these be the same word as Scanzlin or no.

The third name is Ravarin, Ravaren, Lavarin, Lavaren, etc. This is a curious word. It is shared with the Serin, to which indeed it more properly belongs, for *Raperino* and *Verzellino* are names one as common as the other for that bird in Florence; and the Serin has it in various forms, from Raparen at Modena to Rappareddu in Sicily. The etymology appears to be unknown, so at least it is said in Hoare's Dictionary. But there is a word *Rapa* or *Rappa* in Du Cange, which means a hedge or thicket — 'sepes, sepimentum, vel locus sentibus et dumosis obsitus.' If *Raperino* be derived from this, as seems likely enough, it is closely parallel to *Lucarino*, the Siskin; and both alike would simply mean a bird to whose singing 'resonant . . . dumi.' And here I make bold to suggest that we may be on the very track of the unknown origin of *θραυπίς* (v.l. *θραπίς*). The only word which resembles it in Greek is *θραύπαλος*, a shrub in Theophrastus; they may have the same root in common, and that root may be in *rafa* also. *Raperino* and *θραυπίς* may be cognate words, and if that be so Belon may be wrong after all in ascribing, or at least in limiting,

the name *θραυπίς* to the Citril Finch. The Citril and the Serin have various names in common. Their proper names are *Venturone* and *Verzellino*; but both go under such names as Verdolino, Sverzerin or Sverzeli, and Serin itself. So *θραυπίς* may well have served for both, for only a practised eye can tell one bird from the other.

Such evidence as we have, then, leads us to believe that the several names (while subject doubtless to occasional error and confusion) were properly applied as follows: *ἀστραγάλινος*, *ποικιλίς* and *χρυσομίτρης* to the Goldfinch; *ἀκανθίς* and *σπίνος* to the Siskin; *ἀκανθυλλίς* and *θραυπίς* (separately or together) to the Serin and the Citril Finch.

I know no reason, save the empty one that both are singing birds, why anyone should suppose that *ἀκανθίς* or *ἀκαλανθίς* meant the Nightingale, a bird whose one and only name admits of no ambiguity whatsoever. Had the Vergilian scholiasts said not 'alii lusciniæ,' but 'alii *lucarinum* esse volunt, alii carduelæ,' i.e. 'some say the Siskin and some the Goldfinch,' the statement would have been all that an ornithologist could desire. Professor Lindsay, alas, declares that this reading is palaeographically impossible.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

RHETORICA AD ALEXANDRUM, c. 30.

τὰς μὲν οὖν περὶ αὐτὸν τὸν ἄνθρωπον διαβολὰς ἐν ταῖς δημηγορίαις ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπιχειρήσομεν λύειν· αἱ δὲ περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα γίνονται μὲν, ὅταν τις ἡσυχίαν πρὸς τοὺς μὲν ἀδικοῦντας ἢ πρὸς τοὺς κρείττους συμβουλευῇ, ἢ εἰρήνην ποιέσθαι αἰσχροῖν, ἢ παραγῇ περὶ τὰς θυσίας μικρὰ συντελεῖν, ἢ τι τοιοῦτον εἰσηγάται (*Rhet. ad Al.*, c. 30, 1437b, 16-21).

THIS is Bekker's text in the Berlin Aristotle. It is retained by Hammer (in the Teubner *Rhetores Graeci*, I. 2), except for two slight changes, *λύειν ἐπιχειρήσομεν* (word-order) and *ἢ τοὺς κρείττους* (πρὸς omitted), which have some manuscript authority. The real difficulty lies, as many eminent scholars have felt, in *ἡσυχίαν* and the words with which it is constructed. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire translates ὅταν τις ἡσυχίαν συμβουλευῇ by 'quand l'orateur

conseille la guerre,' and with Gallic bravery subjoins, 'Le texte dit précisément le contraire, et il n'y a pas de variante qui permette de le modifier; mais la raison exige absolument le changement que j'ai fait.' Magnificent; but hardly war—the war of scientific criticism. With Teutonic intrepidity Usener would read *πολεμεῖν* for *ἡσυχίαν*, and Kayser *ἡττονας* for *κρείττους*, while Spengel would strike out *μὲν* before *ἀδικοῦντας*. An eirenicon seems possible which may unite in a fresh solution scholars of different lands, who here see the central truth, but not the way to reach it. Insert *λύειν* after *συμβουλευῇ*. The knot is loosed; peace-and-quiet (*ἡσυχία*) is no longer a state-of-war (*πολεμείν*). The general sense will be:

'Personal prejudices against parliamentary speakers we shall endeavour to annul by the methods indicated. Prejudice against the subject-matter of speeches arises when we are advised to annul friendly relations with an unoffending or a stronger power or to make a shameful peace, or are urged to cut down our religious offerings, or have some similar proposal brought before us.' With *τοὺς κρείττους* we should compare Aristotle, *Rhet.* I, c. 4, 1359^b, 38: [ἡ] καὶ πρὸς οὓς ἐπίδοξον πολεμεῖν, ὅπως πρὸς μὲν τοὺς κρείττους εἰρηνεύηται, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἥττους ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἢ τὸ πολεμεῖν: and 1360a, 17 *ib.* The phrase *ἡσυχίαν λύνειν* has the same sense as *εἰρήνην λύνειν*. In this connexion *λύνειν* is the opposite of *ἄγειν*.

λύνειν, which will duly balance the infinitive *ποιεῖσθαι*, may easily have dropped out after *-λενῇ*. It is also to be noticed that an important group among the late manuscripts on which our text depends gives *συμβουλεύειν*. This may well be a conflation of *συμβουλεύη* and *λύνειν*. Does the occurrence, a couple of lines earlier, of *λύνειν*

(which, after all, is a more ordinary word than 'annul' and nearer to 'break up') make against its proposed insertion after *συμβουλεύη*? Not so, I think, in this author, though a fastidious transcriber may have been led to eject it on this score. To the ear any harshness involved in its speedy recurrence is softened if in the former clause it comes before, not after, the main verb. Moreover, the reiteration of words is a marked characteristic of the *Rhet. ad Al.* The salient instance is the adverb *συνληβδην* ('comprehensively'). This word occurs as many as twenty times in the treatise, and often close together. Such excessive partiality for *συνληβδην* is, indeed, one of the many reasons for thinking that the author of the *Rhet. ad Al.* cannot have been Aristotle as we know him elsewhere. Unless he had a 'sylleptic' fit on this solitary occasion, can Aristotle have used *συνληβδην* a score of times in this one brief treatise, and never in all his undisputed works except once in a quotation from Theognis?

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

SOME EMENDATIONS IN ISAEUS.

THE articles on Isaeus contributed by Dr. P. S. Photiades to *Athena* in 1922 and 1923, and noticed by Mr. Adcock in *C.R.* XXXVII., p. 140, contain about a score of corrections of the first four speeches. Most of them appear to me unnecessary; and some are trivialities; thus in I. 11. 6 he changes *ταῦτα* *διέθετο* to *ταύτας* *διέθετο*, and in I. 26. 7 *διαθέμενον* *ταῦτα* to *διαθέμενον* *ταύτας*. I perceive nothing offensive in *ταῦτα* in the first passage, and in the second consider *ταῦτα* better than *ταύτας*. The codex Crippsianus is a poor MS., which deserves no reverence, but on the other hand Isaeus was not a literary artist but a man of business, and it is not difficult for a good scholar such as Dr. Photiades to comb and brush his untidiness. One palmary emendation will keep green the name of Photiades. In IV. 24 A has *μὰ Δὲ ἄλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Ἀγων οὐδ' ὁ Ἀγνόθεος τοῦ Νικοστράτου συγγενεῖς, ὡς οἱ ἀντίδικοί φασιν*,

ἄλλ' ἑτεροί. Schoemann proposed *ἄλλ' αὐτοί*, Hitzig *ἄλλ' αὐτοὶ ἐγγυτέρω*. I accepted the correction *συγγενῆς* from the Florentine scribe who wrote M at the end of the fifteenth century, and did my best with *ἄλλ' ἑτεροί*. By reading *ἄλλ' ἀλλότριοι* Dr. Photiades has healed an ancient wound. Other corrections worthy of a place in the text are these: III. 47. 4 *οὐδεμιᾷ*, *ib.* 50. 7 <ἡ> *κληρονομία*, VIII. 27. 2 *σήματος*, which is nearer to *βήματος* than Schoemann's *μνήματος*. For the *locus desperatus* III. 61 he has a simple solution, to read *ἵνα οὖν μὴ παρὰ τοῦ ἐντυχόντος τῶν κλήρων αἱ λήξεις <ἀλλὰ> τοῖς ἀμφισβητεῖν βουλομένοις γίνωνται*, but owing perhaps to my imperfect knowledge of modern Greek I cannot understand his interpretation of the passage so corrected. I find the same obscurity in his treatment of another famous *crux*, III. 24. 4, where he reads *καὶ πῶς; ὥστε <οὐ>* with an interrogation at the end of the sentence.

Since *Athena* is a periodical not easily accessible, I submit for the consideration of British scholars the following emendations, though for my part I should receive none into the text, and not all into the critical apparatus: I. 51. 4 τὸ <ἴσον> μέρος αὐτοῖς λαβεῖν, II. 22. 3 ὁμολογήσαι ὑμῖν, III. 22. 8 εὐθὺ τριακοσίους, ib. 23. 7 ὅλως οὐδεῖς,

ib. 45. 5 <πῶς> ἐπέτρεψας, ib. 57. 1 κακείνοί γε δῆλοι, ib. 70. 3 <πῶς> ἐπετρέπετε, IV. 1. 5 ὥς <καὶ ὑμεῖς ἴστε>, ib. 7. 1 πολλοὶ τινες, ib. 7. 6 <οὐ> κατὰ δόσιν, ib. 18. 7 νῦν δὲ <οὗτοσι> οὔτε σύσσιτος οὔτε φίλος οὔτ' ἐν τάξει τῇ αὐτῇ, XII. 6. 7. ψευδομαρτυρίου.

W. WYSE.

ATAKTA.

EUR. *H.F.* 554 ff.

HP τί δ' ἐξελεῖπετ' οἶκον ἐστὶν τ' ἐμὴν;
ME βίη, πατὴρ μὲν ἐκπεσὼν στρωτοῦ λέχους.
HP κούκ ἔσχεν αἰδῶ τὸν γέροντ' ἀτιμάσαι;
ME αἰδῶς γ' ἀποικεῖ τῆσδε τῆς θεοῦ πρόσω.

So the passage appears in Murray's text except that he puts three points after λέχους, as if Heracles interrupted. That may be right, but I am not satisfied that the assumption is necessary; for μέν *solitarium* is often used where the speaker deliberately leaves the contrasting clause to be mentally supplied. The treatment of the old man was an additional outrage. For μέν so employed cf. *Soph. Phil.* 159, *Trach.* 69.

There is no MS. variant except that P has αἰδῶς δ' in 557. Most of the earlier editors understood that 'the goddess' was *Bia*, which does not fit with the immediate context and is otherwise unacceptable. Consequently Scaliger's αἰδῶ γ'; (with Lycus as subj. to ἀποικεῖ) has met with some approval, although Kirchhoff and Wilamowitz prefer to substitute a colon, and Wecklein a dash, for the note of interrogation. This small variety is, I think, a sign of uneasiness: each editor desires the meaning which Wilamowitz expresses by 'Lykos und scham! die göttin kennt er nicht,' but hesitates how to punctuate. Badham gave αἰδῶς; notwithstanding that αἰδῶ precedes, and certain tamperings with θεοῦ mentioned in Wecklein's appendix testify to the general dissatisfaction. Murray stands alone in returning to the old interpretation, but with a difference: 'Αἰδῶς has her temple far from the δαίμων that possesses us, δυστυχία or Μοῖρα θανάτου.' But I think most readers will feel that θεοῦ ought to refer to Αἰδῶς, if the text will permit.

Now, so far as I have been able to investigate the question, whenever a word is taken up in stichomythia from one of the interlocutors by the other to express surprise or indignation, it appears in the same case or tense etc. in which it is first employed, and there is no evidence for the addition of γε. Examples will be found in *Ai.* 1127, *Trach.* 429, *Ion* 952. If this generalisation is correct, it puts out of court most of the current views, but a slight alteration will make the matter straight. I believe that we should read αἰδῶς in 556 and αἰδῶς in 557. In that case ἔσχεν means *restrained* as in *Or.* 263 σχήσω σε πηδᾶν δυστυχῇ πηδήματι α and elsewhere.

EUR. *H.F.* 256 f.

ὅστις οὐ Καδμείος ὦν
ἄρχει, κάκιστος, τῶν νέων, ἔπηλυς ὦν.

So the MSS., but it is generally felt that νέων is impossible. Wecklein records a plentiful crop of conjectures, the best of which is Dobree's ἐμῶν adopted by Wilamowitz. It would be just as easy and perhaps more natural as coming from the Chorus to read λεῶν (for the accent see Chandler § 548). Cf. *Soph. Ai.* 1100 ποῦ δέ σοι λεῶν ἔξεστ' ἀκούειν ὦν ὅδ' ἡγήτ' οἰκοθεν.

EUR. *Cycl.* 475.

(Κύκλωπος) ὀφθαλμὸν ὥσπερ σφηκιὰν ἐκθρύφωμεν.

So LP: ἐκθρύφωμεν l Paley: ἐκθύφωμεν Hertlein (followed by Dindorf, Wecklein, and Murray). Scaliger restored ἐκθλίφωμεν, which Paley calls a less appropriate word and Wecklein numbers with the 'coniecturas minus probabiles.' I think it can be shown that Scaliger was right. The vox propria for gathering honey from the comb was βλίττειν (i.e. μ(ε)λιττειν) with

its aor. βλίσαι. Now the schol. on Ar. *Eq.* 794 has: βλίστειν ἐστὶ τὸ ἀφαιρεῖν τὸ μέλι ἀπὸ τῶν κηρίων καὶ πειράζειν καὶ τὸ ψηλαφᾶν καὶ τὸ ἐκπιέζειν, τὰ κηρία τῶν μέλισσῶν θλίβειν. The note has passed to Suid. s.v. who also has βλιμάζειν τὸ ταῖς χερσὶ διαθλίβειν καὶ τὸ τὰ κηρία θλίψαι βλίσαι λέγεται. Both notes appear also in Etym. M. 200, 33 ff. Next it is to be observed that βλίστειν, i.e. θλίβειν, was also applied to a wasps' nest, as is shown by the proverbial σφηκιῶν βλίστειν 'to raise a hornets' nest about one's ears' (Ar. *Lys* 475, Soph. *fr.* 778). After this the appropriateness of ἐκθλίψομεν is hardly to be denied. It is a curious coincidence that the eyes of the blinded sons of Phineus seem to have been compared by Sophocles to a honeycomb (κηρίωμα Soph. *fr.* 715).

SOPH. O.T. 807 ff.

καὶ μὴ ὁ πρέσβυς ὡς ὄρε
ῶν παραστειχόντα τηρήσας μέσον
κάρα διπλοῖς κέντροσι μου καθίκετο.

καθικνεῖσθαι 'to strike' is regularly followed by the genitive, and καθίκετο κάρα has not been justified. Jebb, recognising this, treats κάρα as acc. of the part affected, which is an impossible construction without an accusative preceding. The inference is surely that κάρα is governed by τηρήσας, which takes an acc. with the sense of 'watching for' 'looking out for' in Thucydides (i. 65; iv. 26, 27; v. 82). παραστει-

χόντα is then to be referred to ὄρε. I have very little doubt that ὄρε should be read with Doederlein, the rhythm following *Ant.* 1255. The extremely awkward genitive (ὄρου) thus disappears, but if this is not done it would be possible to take ὄρου with ὄρε, otherwise construing as above.

Rhes. 640.

καὶ ταῦτ' ἐγὼ μὲν εἶπον· ὃν δὲ χρὴ παθεῖν
οὐκ οἶδεν οὐδ' ἤκουσεν ἐγγὺς ὢν λόγου.

Athena gives final directions to Diomedes for the slaying of Rhesus: 'be quick with your work. Meantime I will personate Cyprius and keep Paris engaged.' The lines quoted follow, but are strangely misinterpreted. Paley makes Paris subject to οἶδε and Rhesus subject to παθεῖν: i.e. ὢν = τίνα, for which of course there are plenty of examples. On the other hand, Professor Murray and Mr. Porter make Paris the subject to both verbs: 'on whom my spell is set he knows not . . . 'he with whom I must deal. . . .' (my italics). Does it not occur to them that they are working παθεῖν too hard, and that the subsidiary (deception of Paris) is substituted for the essential (destruction of Rhesus)? It seems to me as clear as daylight that Rhesus is the subject to both verbs. It is true that Heath says that Rhesus was far away: but Heath had not read or had forgotten v. 613.

A. C. PEARSON.

'IT BELLO TESSERA SIGNUM.'

THE late Dr. Henry Bradley made, a few years ago, a contribution of great interest to the interpretation of Virgil. It has been very briefly indicated in Professor Lindsay's edition of the Corpus Glossary (on T 111), but readers of Virgil are more numerous than students of Latin glossaries: hence this note.

On *Aeneid* 7, 637 Servius explains 'tessera' as a 'symbolum bellicum quod ad pugnam exeuntibus datur, scilicet propter confusionem'—a pass-word or countersign by which one may distinguish friend from foe in the press of battle: he quotes examples from the armies of Sulla ('Apollo Delphicus') and Caesar ('Venus Genetrix'). This was a regular use of the term in the Roman army, surviving after the practice of writing the pass-word on a small tablet was replaced by word of mouth; and the officer whose duty it was to get the sign from the

commander and have it passed round was called 'tesserarius.' Many such pass-words are known, and this is the accepted interpretation here. But it is wholly inappropriate to the context, for at this point we are not nearly ready to go into battle. The Gates of War have been opened (601 ff.); hot preparation is afoot, arms are being sought out and furnished up (623 ff.). But as yet there is no organised army: it is only after line 637 that the 'gathering of the clans' begins. Clearly it is not time to issue the pass-word. That, however, is not the only thing that 'tessera' may represent in a military context. It is often an order that is passed round; e.g. in Livy 9, 32, 4 'ex templo tesseram dari iubet ut prandeat miles firmatissime cibo viribus arma capiat,' and many other passages: and this may suggest to us an order sent round the districts calling them to arms. The Abolita Glossary furnishes a striking confirmation in an item which has been preserved

γά
τιθ
φύλ
ἐθε
'γά
dot

has
Do
Sik
tot
eac
Ag
Gr
are
Du
Pod
the
stor
offe
trib
sixt
rem
sur
wer
and
jest

E
of t
into
mos
or I
Aig
H
Sicy
Nov
= p
pig.
at S
Clei

1
Am
147-
2
IV:

more fully in derivative glossaries—'Tesserarius: praepositus currorum qui bella nuntia <n>t (al. nutriunt).' Dr. Bradley made the correction of 'currorum' to 'cursorum' and pointed out the pertinence of the gloss to Virgil's line. If 'tesserarius' can mean the officer commanding the runners who proclaim a state of war, 'tessera' can be the token which conveys their message: and that is exactly what we want here—a real 'bello signum,' something partly analogous to the fiery cross, so that the sentence has its natural place in the narrative. The gloss, belonging to Abolita, probably comes from Festus (see *Ancient Lore in Latin Glossaries*, p. 26); and if so, its authority goes back to the time of Augustus and it attests an ancient usage known to Verrius Flaccus from some old writer, but naturally long obsolete in Italy—such a piece of antiquity as Virgil would love.

H. J. THOMSON.

ORTHAGORISCUS

ἐνθα καὶ πλείστον κατεγέλασε τῶν Σικυωνίων· ἐπὶ γὰρ οὗς τε καὶ θνόν <καὶ χοίρου> τὰς ἐπανυμίας μετατιθεὶς αὐτὰ τὰ τελευταῖα ἐπέθηκε, πλὴν τῆς ἐωντοῦ φύλης· ταῦτα δὲ τὸ ὄνομα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐωντοῦ ἀρχῆς ἔθετο. οὗτοι μὲν δὲ Ἀρχέλαοι ἐκαλέοντο, ἕτεροι δὲ Ὑάται, ἄλλοι δὲ Ὀνεῖται, ἕτεροι δὲ Χοιρεῖται (Herodotus V. 68).

THE alternative suggestions that this story has its origin in the local association of the Dorian tribes with hypothetical place-names in Sikyon, in the crests of wards, or in vestiges of totemism (see Macan, *ad loc.*), appear to me each more improbable than its predecessor. Again, while it may be true that among the Gros Ventre Indians tribal divisions exist which are known by such ridiculous nicknames as Dusty Ones, Coffee, Weasel-skin, Head-dress, Poor Ones, Berry Eaters, or Torn Trousers,¹ there is here no real analogy. The Herodotean story narrates the deliberate application of offensive names to the well-known three Dorian tribes at a time of anti-Dorian reaction. For sixty years—i.e. for as long as the non-Dorians remained in power—the mud stuck. We must surely agree with How and Wells that these were not official appellatives, but nicknames, and that Bury's explanation of their origin in a jest of the tyrant must be upon the right lines.

But the cardinal difficulty of Bury's account of the matter (*History of Greece*, p. 155) is the intolerable strain which it places upon even the most popular etymology. Could a jesting tyrant or his opponents really get *Goat Men* out of *Aigaleoi*?

Here is an alternative suggestion. The Sicyonian royal family were παῖδες Ὀρθαγόρου. Now ὀρθαγορίσκος, a diminutive (compare κυνίσκος = puppy), was the Dorian word for a sucking-pig, such as was offered to Artemis Korythalia at Sparta.² May not the Dorian insult, to which Cleisthenes reacted, have been a pun, not upon

the name of his tribe, but upon that of the founder of his line? He retorted with a *tu quoque*; two of his three names are porcine. Hyatai, as Bury remarks, is no doubt directly suggested by Hylleis. The form Oneatai may perhaps be influenced by the Orneatai, the *perioikoi* of hated Argos.³ For the third name Cleisthenes fell back once more upon the pig idea.

This appears to me perhaps the kind of thing which might have happened; no explanation is likely to get nearer to the truth of the matter than that.

This suggestion, so far as I have been able to discover, has not been made before. Abbott (*History of Greece*, I., p. 370) has noticed the existence of the word ὀρθαγορίσκος, but has applied it to a different problem—viz. that of the relationship of Andreas and Orthagoras. Andreas, he suggests, was the real name of the founder of the tyranny, Orthagoras his nickname. In support of this view we may compare Zeuxidemus, alias Kuniskos.⁴

Nevertheless, I do not think that Abbott's suggestion is convincing. If we accept at its face value the testimony of Ephorus (?) in the papyrus fragment,⁵ Andreas and Orthagoras cannot be alternative names for one person. But I confess that I am a little doubtful whether the old crux has been definitely solved by this new piece of evidence of not very certain value. The chronological perplexities, which the admission of an extra member of the dynasty involves, are most fairly set out by Grenfell and Hunt. To me the new difficulties do not seem easier than the old ones. But however that may be, the view that Orthagoras was only a nickname is for other reasons improbable. It is after all a Greek proper name of perfectly normal construction, and, although it may not be one of the very commonest names, it will be found to occur with some frequency in inscriptions from Boeotia, the home of the celebrated flute-player Orthagoras (Plato, *Protag.* 318c), the Peloponnese, and the Dorian islands.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

DION CHRYSOSTOM, OR. XII. 44.

Λέγω δὲ γραφένον τε καὶ ἀνδριαντοποιῶν καὶ λιθοξόνων καὶ παντὸς ἁπλῶς τοῦ καταξιώσαντος αὐτὸν ἀποφῆναι μνηστῆρ διὰ τέχνης τῆς δαιμονίας φύσεως, εἴτε σκιαγραφία μάλα ἀσθενεὶ καὶ ἀπατηλὴ πρὸς ὄψιν, χρωμάτων μίξει καὶ γραμμῆς ὄψι σχεδὸν τὸ ἀκριβεστάτον περιλαμβανούσῃ, εἴτε λίθων γλυφαῖς, κ.τ.λ.

εἴτε σκιαγρ. μάλα ἀσθ. καὶ γραμμῆς ὄψι σχ. τὸ ἀκρ. περιλαμβ. εἴτε ἀπατηλὴ πρὸς ὄψιν χρ. μίξει,

³ The inhabitants of Kynouria ἐκδεωδιένονται ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀργείων ἀρχόμενοι καὶ τοῦ χρόνου προϊόντος ἐόντες Ὀρνεῖται [καὶ οἱ περίοικοι], Herodotus VIII. 73. For a similar use of what was originally an ethnic as a label to indicate political status Stein, *ad loc.*, aptly quotes the Caerites. Greenidge, *Handbook of Greek Constitutional History*, p. 84, favours the analogous explanation of the word Helot.

⁴ καὶ οἱ γίνονται παῖς Ζευξί ημος, τὸν δὲ Κυνίσκον μετεξέτεροι Σπαρτιητέων ἐκάλεον, Herodotus VI. 71.

⁵ Oxyrhynchus Papyri XI No. 1365.

¹ Kroeber, *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, I., pp. 147-148.

² Hesychius, s.v.; Polemon in Athenaeus IV. 139b.

Kayser. περιλαμβανούσης, libri, περιλαμβανούση, Reiske. (J. von Arnim's apparatus).

THIS passage enumerates five ways of representing the divine form, and apparently proceeds from vague and indeterminate to more concrete techniques. There is a clear distinction between the two methods of painting on a plane surface. Σκιαγραφία is scene painting, which produced its deceptive effects at long range by a judicious manipulation of light and shade without gradations of tone;¹ the second method involves definite outlines (compare Parrhasios: *in lineis extremis palmam adeptus*), and a mixture of colours. This distinction disposes of Kayser's extensive remodelling. But an εἶρε is needed before χρωμάτων. How was it lost? There are two clues. The manuscript reading is περιλαμβανούσης, which hangs

in the air as the text now stands. But it may point to a parallel participle at the end of the first clause, both agreeing with τέχνης. Further, we may conjecture what that participle was from a passage in Plato which probably influenced Dion's phraseology, since both places deal with the delineation of the divine nature: σκιαγραφία δὲ δσαφεὶ καὶ ἀπατηλῇ χρώμεθα περὶ αὐτὰ (*Kritias*, 107d).² I suggest that χρωμένης fell out before χρωμάτων by similarity of the first four letters, carrying with it the missing εἶρε, and that the form περιλαμβανούσης is a definite indication of this omission. Read: . . . ἀπατηλῇ πρὸς δὲ ψιν <χρωμένης, εἶρε> χρωμάτων . . . περιλαμβανούσης.

A. S. FERGUSON.

² Cf. ἀκριβές in c 6. Dion, however, uses σκιαγραφία and ἀκριβέστατον in a different sense, because he contrasts techniques with an increasing degree of determinateness.

¹ See R. Schöne, *Jahrbuch des k. Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, Bd. 27, 1912.

REVIEWS

THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY.

The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. I.: Egypt and Babylonia to 1580 B.C. Pp. xxii + 704; 13 maps. Cambridge: The University Press, 1923. 35s.

THERE is a story that on an occasion towards the end of the war there was a sudden and unexplained shortage of silver coins at Athens. Most people thought that, if it was not an accident, somebody was trying by making a corner to embarrass the Government. Not so Professor Myres, who was in Athens at the time. He thought (so it is said) that the shortage of silver was a blind, which was to cover a real attempt by Royalists to make a corner in the nickel coins, which were then to be sent to Germany. An ingenious theory, the weak spot of which was that one of the results of the silver shortage (which was over in a fortnight) was a great increase in the quantity of nickel currency. One's pockets bulged with nickel coins, when before they had decently housed a silver didrachm or two. So with much that Professor Myres writes. Suspicion is aroused by this weakness of his for ingenious speculations. They seem to imply that the rest of mankind are like himself. But they are not. Not even other writers on ancient history are like him. One must not, I suppose, be sorry for

this. Yet one leaves his two chapters on geological and neolithic man with regret. For he has a command of his material, an imaginative grasp, and, above all, a sense of style beyond that of his colleagues. Take this from his opening paragraphs:

But the spoken word does not fall to the ground like the spent missile or the broken vessel, to be its own memorial of human achievement; it vanishes in air, so that the philologist deals not with originals, but at best with the reminiscences of an echo. To recover, therefore, what men were doing or making, still more what they were thinking or desiring, before the dawn of history, the sole available method is that of the archaeologist, merging as it does in that of the geologist, since these alone handle and interpret original creations of men's thought and will, and contemporary elements of the physical surroundings of those men. Where the tree falls there shall it lie; and where the lost implement or shattered potsherd or worn-out man fell, there have they lain, for all that anyone cared then or knows now. It is the carelessness (in the literal sense) of the river as to the gravel which it carried, and an equal carelessness of those men as to what happened to their leavings, that justify such a hypothesis of the credibility of these data, and make prehistoric times at least a penumbra of history.

Admirable alike as a piece of English and as a description of the evidence for prehistoric times.

The imaginative method may not be for all periods of history; it is difficult

certainly to think of it applied to the Kings of Isin, Larsa, and Babylon, with whom Mr. Campbell Thompson has to struggle. It requires a large canvas uncrowded by multifarious detail; if it observes the unities of time and space, it has the world for its stage, and its time is geological. But Professor Myres rightly uses it for prehistoric man, and in the right way. There is perhaps hardly one theory he puts forward of which one would say, 'this must be so,' or even 'this is probably so.' Some are wholly fantastic; and only a geologist could test much of what he writes. But the method is sound. Nor must it be thought that he lets his imagination run free. On the contrary, he is in general cautious, especially as to 'races' of men, about which many duller men have had wilder theories than he, and in his treatment of early religions. Only rarely, as in the case of the origin of the Mongols in Central Asia (pp. 22-3), does he argue the presence of man from the absence of remains — because nomads do not leave remains; though, like everyone else, he frequently bases the widest conclusions on single and isolated finds, such as the negroid skeletons of the Grimaldi caves, and others, even more doubtfully, on the presence of certain physical types in present-day populations. Biologists, after all, are not yet, or perhaps I should say are no longer, dogmatic about variations in human types. There remain two more important criticisms to make. The actual achievements of palaeolithic men in Western Europe — that is to say, their art — deserve a greater emphasis and a more particular description. They are something more than historical evidence. Secondly, a clearer statement of the actual evidence for earliest man — Neanderthal, Pilt-down, Mousterian, and the like — is badly needed. Professor Macalister, in his excellent chapter on 'Exploration and Excavation,' does not give it; and Professor Myres' style has an allusive quality which in itself is admirable, as Meredith taught, but in this case requires almost an expert's knowledge of the evidence to make it properly intelligible.

It is interesting and not uncharacteristic that Professor Myres becomes, or seems to become, less trustworthy as the evidence gets more plentiful, as it becomes at the same time more complex and more pliable. Pass from his brilliant and shifting sands to Professor Peet and you are in a different world. Professor Peet is solid as a rock. When he says a thing is so, it must be; when he says 'it is probable,' you feel that all the evidence has been weighed, and you will be quite safe in registering his opinion in your mind, especially when he says: 'For the present almost every new object of importance dating from these early times in Egypt merely serves to convince us, if we are wise, of the extent of our ignorance.' There is only one point which I at least am inclined still to doubt, on general grounds — his statement that the ethical standard of Egypt was almost purely selfish:

As we might say in our modern phrase virtue 'paid' on the whole. It gained the approval of a man's fellow-creatures because they were benefited by it. 'I did that which all men approved' was perhaps the highest piece of self-commendation which a noble could inscribe upon his tomb.

After all, not many nobles of other nations could, or would, say as much; and the Egyptians are not the only people who have said of honesty that it is the best policy. Similarly, when Mr. Cook says of the Semites, 'There is admiration for any manifestation of personal power and ability as distinct from its ethical value or its consequences,' that does not distinguish them, for it is true also of other countries — Italy, for example.

Mr. Wace has not been allowed enough space for his account of the earliest Aegean civilisation. This is almost the only criticism one can make of the general arrangement and editorship of the volume. In part this is no doubt inevitable. Where there are no written records, or those records are indecipherable, there are few details with which to fill in the picture. Still, this was the first European civilisation; and even though this volume only describes its beginnings, and does not reach the great age even of Crete, it does not get enough emphasis. In the space at his disposal, however, Mr.

Wace gives a very clear account of the beginnings of Greece, though I see no reason for the view that the pictographic writing of the Middle Minoan period, 'together with the use of complicated signets, seems to imply an officialdom of an oriental type.' All that we have of Minoan Crete is as European as fifth-century Athens. In my opinion, too, Mr. Wace plays too often with suppositions of changes of race wherever we observe a change in pottery, or methods of burial, or the like. Apart from the dubiousness of all such theories (for peoples change their customs under influence from abroad), it is culture, and not problems of ethnology, which are important, especially when the language is unknown. Professor Macalister, by the way, omits to mention Mr. Wace's most important excavations at Mycenae in 1920-22, as indeed he passes over most of the scientific work done since Schliemann—at Mycenae by Tsountas, at Tiryns and Orchomenos by the Germans, and in Corinthia by Blegen—work which has changed the aspect of things since Schliemann's day.

A monumental work of this importance naturally suggests many criticisms, though mostly in matters of detail, as this review must already have made only too clear. But there are some others which may be made by a general reader, for it is he, the editors tell us in the preface, who 'is constantly kept in view throughout; and our aim is to steer a middle course between the opposite dangers, a work which only the expert could read or understand, and one so "popular" that serious students would rightly regard it with indifference.' The latter danger has been most successfully avoided. Doubtless Professor Langdon and Mr. Thompson had a more difficult task with Sumer and Babylonia than Mr. Hall with Egypt, for the story is a more complicated one. But they both obscure the story with a mass of detail which the reader cannot possibly carry—vast numbers of kings and patesis with impossible names. The chapter on Hammurabi is clear, but much of the rest is not. What is the use, for instance, of cluttering up the book with detail like this (which is not unique by

any means): 'Isin and Babylon . . . and the small city of Rapišum allied themselves against Larsa and Ur under Rim-sin. This Rapišum can hardly be the Rapišum mentioned by Tukulti-Ninurta, three days' march north of Sippar; and in all probability there was another of the name.' What has the general reader to do with one or a dozen Rapišums? seeing that not Tukulti-Ninurta nor either Rapišum is mentioned elsewhere in the book, and neither finds a place on the map. The very conscientious maker of the index seems to agree, for both Tukulti—etc., and Rapišum are there omitted. On the other hand, he does record the mention by Professor Langdon of Igigi, Imi, Nani (also to be distinguished from another Nani), Elulu (or Ilulu), and Dudu, ephemeral kings of Agade—names and nothing more. It is all the more unnecessary, for there is an excellent and full list of kings and patesis of Sumer and Akkad at the end of the volume. Fortunately Mr. Hall did not think it necessary to mention all the kings of the thirteenth and fourteenth dynasties of Egypt, Sekhem-resesheditau Sebekemsaf II. and the rest. On the other hand, many difficult questions, such as that of the chronology of Egypt, receive just the right amount of discussion.

There is one important and obscure point which receives no explanation—the relation of Gudea of Lagash to the dynasty of Gutium. Gudea, one of the greatest of Sumerian figures, had a long, prosperous, and apparently peaceful rule, noted chiefly for its religious and artistic activities. The extent of his rule appears to be uncertain; but he was able to get material—cedar, gypsum, marble, gold, silver, copper—from Syria, from the Taurus, from the Zagros; and he conquered Anshan in Elam. He 'certainly lived under the kingdom of Gutium,' though 'the business archives of his reign make no reference at all to the tribute paid to the kings of this foreign dynasty' (p. 433). Yet this was a 'period of anarchy and terrible oppression of the barbarians from Gutium' (p. 434); so that no city from Sippar to Eridu has any history, 'with the remarkable exception of Lagash, which does not appear to have suffered such

total extinction of culture under the kings of Gutium' (p. 437). A phenomenon so curious ought not to have been left unexplained.

The general get-up of this volume, the paper and print, are all admirable. (I have noticed only two misprints which might confuse: 'Khian of the thirteenth dynasty' for fifteenth (or sixteenth?) on p. 175; and 'Nebuchadrezzar' on p. 563 should be distinguished as 'Nebuchadrezzar I.'). But the maps are most of them miserable affairs. One would have expected one good physical map of Egypt and one of Mesopotamia; or at least one on a smaller scale of the whole of the Middle East from Egypt to Elam. It is vain, I know, to ask for illustrations, though in that section of history which is based entirely or mainly on objects, and for the chapters on art, they are a necessity, especially when there is no special reference in the bibliography to those books where illustrations are to be found. There is such a reference in the bibliography for Mr. Hall's very jejune chapter on the art of early Egypt and

Babylonia; but that is no help, for the same reference might as well be given in place of the entire chapter. The general reader may be expected to know the Pyramids, but not the statue of Senusret III. or the stele of Naram-Sin (if he did, he would be surprised to find Mr. Hall saying that the latter is 'undoubtedly fit to rank with the best that Egypt or Crete can produce'); and chapters (intended for general readers) on art without illustrations could be spared. But more important are illustrations of pottery and other objects where these are used to support arguments concerning movements of races or cultures; without them such arguments appear too dogmatic and are sooner forgotten. And we should particularly have liked an illustration to one of Professor Myres' more imaginative efforts: Mongoloid man had protective camouflage in the structure of his hair; 'while its extreme length in both sexes serves to disguise the characteristic profile of the human head and neck, and approximate it to that of a quadruped seen from behind.'

A. W. GOMME.

A CHRISTIAN CORPUS.

Recueil des Inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure. Publié sous les auspices de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres par HENRI GRÉGOIRE. Fascicule I. Folio. Pp. iv + 128. Paris, 1922.

THIS great work, planned over thirty years by the late Mgr. Duchesne and promoted by M. Homolle, had its foundations laid in the listing of Christian texts by M. Cumont (1895). His notes were transferred (1907) to the present editor, who here publishes 534 inscriptions from the dioceses of Asia, the Islands, Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, and Lydia; for such an achievement much gratitude is due to the Academy which made it possible and to M. Grégoire. In method, except for its 'literary' instead of 'literal' transcription, the collection resembles Lefebvre's Egyptian *Recueil* (1907), to which, however, it is far superior in variety and interest. Lefebvre, among his 808 texts, has but two dozen (*i.e.* about 1 in 32)

of the first rank; Grégoire, among his 534, gives not less than 66 (about 1 in 8) which are historically notable. Both print a number of inscriptions not previously known. Lefebvre's are of the short funerary type, whereas four of Grégoire's are long and important (100⁸, 107, 220^{bis}, 282^{ter}). The mass of learning lucidly embodied in the notes is all the more helpful because of the unfamiliarity of Byzantine spelling, terms, and abbreviations. Perhaps the most conspicuous fruit of the editor's toil are the old documents, for years half understood or meaningless, that now appear virtually new. Thus the poem in 81-82 (*C.I.G.* 8749) was probably written by Nicephorus Blemmydes about 1222; 83 (*C.I.G.* 9283) is the epitaph of John Vatatzes or of Theodore Lascaris; 224^{ter} (*C.I.G.* 2883^d) may refer to one of the last 'prophets' of the Didymaeon Apollo (Rousset's *εὐ]χρηστίαν ὦ(ν)* instead of *Χρηστία-νῶ(ν)* finds no support in the context);

the judge in 247 (C.I.G. 8644) is the sixth-seventh century historian Theophylact; the Michael of 226⁸ (C.I.G. 8836) was an officer of the usurper Bardas Phocas; the bishop Theoleptos of 343^{bis} (C.I.G. 8758) was eminent in the early fourteenth century. These are but a few specimens of the wealth which here for the first time becomes really accessible. Since the editor invites help in filling the unavoidable lacunae, we may note the following omissions: Smyrna, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1887, 249, 10: dated slab; Mouseion, 1876-1878, 44: ὑπὲρ εὐχῆς κτλ. Erythrae, *Jahreshefte*, 1910, Beibl. 74: two epitaphs. Antiphellos, B.C.H., 1894, 325: ὁ περὶ εὐχῆς κτλ. Thyatira, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1899, 237, 3: epitaph which seems certainly Christian, as pointed out by Calder, 'Philadelphia and Montanians,' *Bull. J. Rylands Library*, 1923, p. 347; B.C.H., 1887, 465, 30, and *R. de Phil.*, 1913, 325, 17: texts mentioning Gratian and Valentinian. Maeonia, B.C.H., 1893, 638: inscribed amulet; R.E.G., 1901, 301, 2: epitaph, probably of a Jewess, invoking Μησωλ (= 'Lord' in Hebrew?). Philadelphia, J.H.S., 1917, 92, 4, 5, and 100, 11: three epitaphs; R.E.G., 1901, 302, 3: ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Νέας Κολο-

φώνος?). Mendechora, J.H.S., 1917, 95, 8: text of A.D. 515. Sardis, *Mouseion*, 1878-1880, 183: preamble of decree, sixth or seventh century; *Am. J. A.*, 1914, 10-11, 12 (like our 265), and 13: epitaph; *L.B.W.*, 1654: formula ἔσται αὐτῷ π. τ. θεόν (as in our 8). The better copy of 342 in J.H.S., 1917, 99, 9, has been overlooked. The proof-reading leaves a good deal to be desired (e.g. *μυσρῶνα* for *μυσερῶν*, 324, l. 2); and the rendering in type of the Greek originals is by no means faultless. In 28 Munro's copy is hardly recognisable; 63, where the fourth letter is μ, not η, should probably be read ὁ θ(ε)ός με ὁ(ρ)ᾷ. The transcription of 38 seems to be ἄρ(ος) Παρθεν(ίου) καὶ βασιλικ(όν); cf. 89 and 333^{ter}. The verses in 37 may have run thus: Φρίξον τρώμω τε καὶ | κλαυ[σ]ον βλέπ[ων πρὸς] τοῦ βίου δρόμ[ον, μήπως] | σκότος κάτο | (π)έσι + ἴσκει μάτον ἄνε|υ τίς οὐσί|[as γέμων?]. For the spelling of (ι)σχημάτων cf. 344, ll. 3-4. 315 may be read as a verse: [πρ]οσφόρως ὕ|κεσθαι, κα(ν) ὁράο[ς] πρᾶτ[τ]ομεν (i.e. εὐχεσθαι ὁραίως). Corrections noted from my copies are: 324, l. 1, γνῶ(σις) τῶν διατυπωθ(έντων); 338, l. 13, συνβήου μου ἅμα δέ, as in Fontrier's copy; 325 (cf. Hirschfeld's copy, Vienna), βοθη[σ]ι ἐπισκόπου θεός +.

W. H. BUCKLER.

THE ORIGINAL GREEK METRE.

Les Origines indo-européennes des Mètres grecs. By A. MEILLET. Pp. viii + 78. Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 1923. Price 12 fr.

THE author argues that metre in any language depends upon the rhythmic structure of that language, and that the ancient Indo-European verse, 'devait reposer sur des alternances de longues et de brèves, être caractérisée par υ-, admettre des séquences telles que υυ et --, et ne comporter υυυ que par exception.' He goes on to say that iambic and trochaic Greek verse and the Aeolian lyric types such as the Sapphic sprang from 'un seul et même type indo-européen dont les vers védiques de 8, 11 et 12 syllabes ont conservé l'image plus fidèlement que les types grecs.' He does not seem to

be acquainted with the writings of certain other scholars upon this subject, notably E. V. Arnold and J. W. White. 'It is now a commonplace of Comparative Metric,' says the latter, 'that the primitive poetic forms in Aryan speech were a dimeter of eight and a trimeter of eleven or twelve syllables' (*Verse of Greek Comedy*, § 600). A more novel and certainly interesting suggestion is that the hexameter was borrowed more or less from the Aegean civilisation, but here also, as the author says himself, he has been anticipated by K. Meyer.

He hardly seems to have thought out his views very profoundly. After saying that Greek metre had no ictus, he admits (p. 61) that the hexameter was accompanied by 'un instrument

à percussion qui soulignait le rythme,' and (p. 20) that 'plus une musique est élémentaire . . . plus le rythme y est régulier, plus brutalement il y est marqué.' If verse is sung to a rhythm 'brutalement marqué,' what does it matter whether you say the verse in itself had an ictus or not? Again he asserts that there was only a 'quantitative rhythm' in both Vedic and Greek verse. What is a 'quantitative rhythm'? For Greek verse, at any rate, it is a meaningless phrase. ---o--- may be Ionic or Dorian or glyconic or half a hexameter, and the difference in value of these four is immense; if the rhythm were simply quantitative, would they not all be the same? And the greater part of the Vedic verse was composed of long and short syllables quite promiscuously; that is to say that it had so far *no* quantitative rhythm, but the verse must have depended on something else than quantity. What was this? The only possible answer seems to be that it was the musical rhythm, as in the case of a Gregorian chant, where the phrase has no definite quantity or rhythm till just at the end and yet is a musical unit.¹ To discuss metre without taking the music into consideration is to talk of colours while ignoring the light which makes them what they are. 'But we do not know the music.' Then argue from the known to the unknown, as M. Meillet does when he says that all primitive music has a rhythm 'brutalement marqué.' Probably he is right in this, and it is refreshing to see him come out of the enchanted castle of metrical cobweb into the realm of common sense. Dancers, too, fancy dancers dancing without an ictus! If anybody can point out any music or any dancing whatever which has no ictus, it will then be time to talk about metres which were sung and danced as having none. But I fear I may be stirring up a hornets' nest again.

It always surprises me that metricians speak as if quantitative metre were dead. It is very much alive—e.g., in

¹ It is curious to observe that the recent development of the French Alexandrine has ended in the primitive form of a long verse with no regularisation except at the twelfth syllable.

Persia. Make as much allowance as you please for the differences, still there in Persia is verse depending on quantity and including ionics, glyconics, iambics, and trochees. The Oriental theorists divide up a glyconic into -oo-|o-o-, exactly as a Greek theorist did, and they regard it as the third variation of -o-o-|---o-, whereof the seventh variation is o-o-|o-o-. But when it comes to the point they do sing it as a cyclic dactyl ('horresco referens'), two trochees and a long syllable. When I consider these things I am greatly inclined to believe that the cobwebs of the metricians have not a very close relation to facts, and to agree with M. Meillet when he contemptuously throws over Aristoxenus and the rest bag and baggage. But he really ought to have discussed the question more seriously. He will dismiss the Persians, I daresay, with yet greater contempt, but to me they do seem to throw a flood of light upon the way in which Greek metres actually worked in practice, especially in their cross-rhythms. To argue from dead metres like Sanscrit, which we do not know how to read, to metres which actually exist alive, is as if one should argue from the bones of a mesozoic reptile to the intestines of a modern lizard. So do I sit bloated in the middle of *my* cobweb.

M. Meillet objects to dividing most Greek metres into feet at all. But to deny feet to a Sapphic because it may have been developed out of a footless line like the Sanscrit is to confuse the origin of a metre with its mature form. If you can prove barred music to be developed from Gregorian that will not prove that it is not barred. Surely the most interesting question about the Sapphic is not whether it came from an unbarred line of eleven syllables, but what was the rhythm to which Sappho set those syllables: that rhythm is fixed, and I do not see how anyone with a sense of rhythm can sing it save in one way, whatever theories he may spin about it, and sing it in feet or bars he must. Rhythm is like the golden tree of life and 'grey is all theory': let the origin be what it will, the tree will expand in its own way and will shatter the pipkin theory to which you seek to

confine it. And to measure living things needs all the resources of science. No one could measure the gallop of a horse before instantaneous photography; now we see what the early guesses were worth. No one could measure much modern verse rhythm before the kymograph, and the theorists had better test their theories by it. If only Aristoxenus had possessed one!

If I find it impossible to follow M. Meillet on these general questions, neither can I accept a number of his details. Thus Porson's law is incorrectly stated on p. 52, things are said about the epic on p. 61 which make one stare, the pentameter is said on p. 70 to be 'shorter' than the hexameter, and on p. 74 we are told that there are 'quatre types de la mesure à 5 temps connus dans l'usage: -o-o-, o-o-, -ooo et ooo-o-, as if those were all.

Much the most interesting part of this treatise is the comparison with Sanscrit at the beginning, and it is unfortunate for M. Meillet that he had not met with the works mentioned above which have anticipated him, at any rate in the main. His remarks on the difficulty of fitting the Greek language to the hexameter (pp. 57-60) are valuable, and appear to have a great deal of truth in them.

N.B.—The statements about Persian metre made above are guaranteed by Sir E. Dennison Ross. He informs me also that the Oriental theorists never breathe a hint about ictus. Powerful logicians will conclude that the Persian poets had none; but they were like Alcaeus and Sappho, human beings, not mesozoic lizards.

ARTHUR PLATT.

FURNEAUX, HAVERFIELD, AND ANDERSON.

Cornelii Taciti De Vita Agricolae. Edited by H. FURNEAUX. Second edition revised and largely rewritten by J. G. C. ANDERSON, with contributions by the late Professor F. HAVERFIELD. One vol. 8vo. Pp. lxxxvii + 192. Twenty-five maps, plans, and illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922. 7s. 6d. net.

FURNEAUX' *Agricola* was published twenty-five years ago, and at that time the possibilities of archaeological research as we know it to-day were hardly imagined. Roman sites in this country had indeed been carefully surveyed, inscriptions had been collected and excavations undertaken; but till about 1895 the use of the spade as an instrument of precision was not understood by our antiquaries, and the results which it was capable of yielding were wholly unsuspected. Furneaux' edition was published at the very moment when a new epoch in the study of ancient history was beginning—namely, the epoch of scientific digging. If anyone asks what scientific digging has done, he cannot do better than compare the original Furneaux with Mr. Anderson's admirable new edition of it, for the main difference between the two books is

simply that Mr. Anderson's is enriched by the archaeological labours of the last twenty-five years. These have, as Mr. Anderson says, 'let in a flood of light' upon the history of Roman Britain, and in especial upon the work of *Agricola*, for his is a name which has never been long absent from the mind of any English or Scottish antiquary whose studies have led him to the Roman period. The new way of studying that period was especially preached and practised by Professor Haverfield, and it was only natural that he should design a new edition of the *Agricola* in which its fruits, so far as they could be connected with Tacitus' narrative, should be summarised. It was well known that he was working on this edition at the end of his life, but his sudden death cut his work short; and Mr. Anderson, who undertook to carry it on, was faced with the difficult task of preparing for publication a work which was not only incomplete, but of which very little was actually on paper at all. All readers of the book—and they will be numerous—will be grateful to him for a volume which, small as it is to the eye, contains a vast quantity of material, and represents an amount

of labour actually greater than would have been the case had the book been written by a single hand; for nothing is harder than to edit the work of another, especially if it deals with a subject on which that other is the leading authority. And here the editing is twofold, Haverfield's own work being superimposed on a stratum of Furneaux'. The result is not only an edition of the *Agricola* which will for many years be the standard edition, but also a storehouse of archaeological detail relating to Roman Britain. The Clarendon Press is especially to be congratulated on producing so important a work at so low a price, and on supplying it with excellent maps, plans, and illustrations. But we could have done with fewer advertisements. At the end they were no doubt inevitable; but why should they crop out at the beginning as well?

R. G. COLLINGWOOD.

Every part of the book has been revised with care and skill. To Mr. Collingwood's testimony I would add that the text has been overhauled, not only where *E* and *T* have shown up *A* and *B*, but throughout; and that in the commentary as much good thought has been bestowed on points of Latinity as on matters of archaeology and history. Little of Furneaux's that was worth keeping has been cut out; his wording has often been altered, seldom wantonly, mostly for the better; and the substance of his notes has been largely improved and enriched.¹

So good a book can do without lengthy praise, and I will give the rest of my space to some suggestions which might make the next edition even better than this.

(1) Haverfield's part in the work should be treated with the same pious freedom as Furneaux's. His last thoughts, if he had lived to print, might well have been juster to the claim which Tacitus makes for *Agricola* in x. 5; and he might have cancelled the remark

¹ Mr. Anderson wishes these corrections to be made:—On p. xxxvi add a quotation-mark after *Graupius*; in the note on p. xlviii read 'Denbighshire'; in one of the notes on p. 89 read 'M. Trebellius Maximus, consul probably in A.D. 56 or 55'; on p. 165 read *viii* for *vii*.

about Intimilium which stands on p. xxxix (does not Tacitus add 'Liguriae pars est?'). And the next edition of his chapter on the MSS. should give pride of place to *E*: it is topsy-turvy to begin with the worse MSS. just because they were brought into play before their betters. Room would thus be saved, which might be used to give us something more about the readings of Puteolanus and Ursinus.

(2) It is penny-wise of the publishers to tuck away the Index Nominum in the middle of the book.

(3) A welcome addition would be a list of the points in which the discovery of *E* and *T* necessitates corrections of Gerber and Greef's Lexicon.

(4) I append a few remarks on certain passages.

ix. 1. The ablative 'administratione,' 'in respect of its functions,' is lame. I conjecture 'splendida inprimis dignatus administratione.'

xvi. 2. Insert 'revocare tamen placuit,' or words to that effect, after 'restituit.' At the end of the section 'ut suae cuiusque iniuriae ultor' must mean 'as every man (is apt to do) in avenging a wrong done to himself.' Because it was against himself that the Britons had rebelled, Paulinus might be more ruthless than a successor.

xxi. 3. Tacitus, to be sure, can twist anything into a vice for the nonce, but colonnades, baths, and tasteful repasts, make a strange trio of vices even for him. His other uses of the word 'delenimentum' suggest that 'delenimenta vitiorum' means 'palliatives of vice.'

xxiv. 3. The conjecture 'audivit' deserves mention; it transfers the false estimate from the Roman general to the Irish refugee.

xli. 2. ('tot militares viri cum tot cohortibus expugnati et capti.') Furneaux boldly translated 'militares viri' by 'officers.' Mr. Anderson is more cautious: "Military men," "soldiers," as we say: officers are here meant.' But 'soldiers' is here said; and 'so many soldiers with so many cohorts' is a phrase not to be borne. Hence the old conjectures 'vici' and 'numeri'; which do not satisfy, though it is no good answer to them to show that

'expugnati' can be used of persons. I had thought of 'limitares vici,' but I would rather suggest 'tribuni,' supposing that 'militares viri,' or at least

'militares,' started life as an annotation. For the next word but one I prefer the 'totis' of *E*'s text to its marginal 'tot.'

E. HARRISON.

RADERMACHER'S *FROGS*.

Aristophanes' 'Frösche.' Einleitung, Text und Kommentar von L. RADERMACHER. (*Akad. der Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-historische Klasse*, 198. Band, 4. Abhandlung, 1921.)

THIS is an excellent commentary which deserves careful consideration from all students of Aristophanes. Radermacher is well read in the literature of his author, and his own views are always suggestive. He is noticeably fair to work done outside his own country, especially in England and America. The special feature of his edition, though by no means its only merit, is the thorough examination of the play in the light of comparative folklore. It must be confessed that the results do not affect the interpretation of the text to any considerable extent, but it was a task worth undertaking, and few classical scholars could do it better than the author of *Das Jenseits im Mythos der Hellenen*.

The Introduction deals mainly with the origin of Comedy and the influence of the Old Comedy on the New. As many are interested in the problem of the Origin of Comedy, I offer what, I hope, is a fair summary of R.'s view.

Κωμῳδία is an Attic invention developed out of the Attic *κῶμος* and the Doric actor. There is no need to seek elsewhere for its origin. It owes nothing to Epicharmos, Phormis, or any other Sicilian. Epicharmos had no Dionysiac Festival behind him. His plays are never called comedies, but *δράματα*. He had a chorus, but there is no evidence that his chorus ever appeared under animal forms. He may have influenced Attic Tragedy to some extent at the beginning when its development was still uncertain. Phrynichus, for instance, may have owed his preference for the trochaic tetrameter to this source. But there is no reason to believe that he influenced Comedy. Comedy implies a masked *κῶμος*. (This,

according to R., should rule out Aristotle's statement that it was derived from the Phallophoroi, since the Phallophoroi were not masked.) What a *κῶμος* was like can be inferred from Aristotle's story in Athen. 348 of the rich man Telestagoras who had become a proverb among the fishermen of Naxos because of his meanness, and on this account was 'ragged' (*ἐκώμασαν πρὸς αὐτόν*) by a band of youths carrying a large fish. This looks like an aetiological story to explain the custom of a *κῶμος* carrying such symbols as a fish or swallows or crows. Probably it was some spring celebration in which the *κῶμος* went round begging, and the fish, etc., which they carried was a begging symbol. Traces of some such origin survive in Varro's account (based upon ancient authority) that Comedy derives from the custom of the youth of Attica who *circum uicos ire solita fuerat et quaestus sui causa hoc genus carminis promuntiabat*. . . . The *περὶ κωμῳδίας* preserves the same tradition when it speaks of *κωμῳδία ἀγυρτρὶς*. R. would also find a trace of it in the fragment of Aristophanes' *Danaides* (Athen. 57 A), where the vegetables which the chorus carry under their armpits represent the harvest of their begging tour. Such a *κῶμος* by itself could not develop into drama without an Agon, and there is no reason to search for the Agon in the masked *βουκολιασταί* of Syracuse. It is 'allgemein Hellenisches.' Here, I think, he will carry most readers with him, since the improvised wrangle with its improvised 'back-chat' is common to mankind everywhere, and must lie at the bottom of all comic drama. The Agon, then, formed part of the *κῶμος*. Parabasis and Agon are the primal elements from which Comedy at Athens has developed. They are part of a concerted performance which begins in motion in the Parabasis and ends in a position of rest in the Agon. The

phrase παραβαίνειν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον is in the same construction as ἄδειν or κωμάζειν πρὸς τινα.

I note a few of the passages in which it seems to me that R. has improved the interpretation, and a few in which I should differ from him:

27 ὄνος should be read with Ravennas (not οὔνος), since there is a play on the use of the word as a slang term for a slave, a meaning now known from *Par. Berol.* 9941. 93 χελιδόνων μουσεία. Tucker is surely right in insisting that the original phrase in the Alkmene must have been ἀηδόνων μ. 119 ἄγαν is constructed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with θερμὴν as well as ψυχράν. 179 γεννάδας is a word imported into Athens from Laconia. 'Your master is a man κατὰ Δώριον τρόπον.' 227 R. reads in his note (but not in his text) οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔστ(ε) ἀλλ' ἡ κοῦξ, and *Lysist.* 139 certainly seems to support this view. 396 μολπῇ belongs to the Eleusinian terminology. Hence Iacchus, who (as Foucart has shown) is really a stranger in Eleusis, is summoned ᾠδαῖσι, not μολπαῖσι. 565 I should hesitate to accept R.'s defence of πω here. He thinks that δεισάσα πω is equivalent to οὐπω θαρροῦσαι. 608 Σκεβλύας perhaps suggests κέβλος, a word for a 'monkey' preserved by Hesychius. Παρδόκας = Spartacus, but also conveying the popular derivation of all such names from πέρδεσθαι, as can be seen from Strabo 619 C. 625 οὐτω = ἀνευ τιμῆς. 655 ἐπεὶ προτιμᾶς

γ' οὐδέν; ἐπεὶ = alioquin (? enim). Cf. an inscription from Cayster valley ἐξέστω δὲ μηδενὶ ἐτέρῳ ἐξωτικῷ τεθῆναι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μνημεῖον, ἐπεὶ ἀποδώσει εἰς τὸν τοῦ Καίσαρος φίσκον δηνάρια ἑπτακόσια. 694 R. defends Kirchhoff's view. The Plataeans, after the destruction of their city, had been given Athenian citizenship and settled in Skione in Chalcidice. The slaves manumitted after Arginusae were also settled at Skione (cf. schol.) and in this sense were Plataeans. 710 R. would read κυκησίτεφροι, since nouns of this formation ought always to be active in sense. 790 R. holds (as, I think, rightly) that ὑποχωρεῖν cannot mean 'conceded,' which would be παραχωρεῖν (cf. 767), but must mean 'Aeschylus (κάκκεινος) made room for him.' There is no reason why two persons should not share a θρόνος. He compares Plutarch, *Inst. Lac.* 237 D, where young Spartans are instructed τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἐντρέπεσθαι . . . ὁδῶν ὑποχωροῦντας. 903 R. pertinently quotes Philo, *de plant.* 24 τυφῶσι μὲν . . . αὐτόπρεμνα δένδρα πρὸς ἀέρα ἀνασπᾶται. αὐτόπρεμνος (= αὐτόρριζος) is used proleptically. Λόγοις is substituted for δένδροις. 'He falls on the arguments, as if they were trees and uproots them and scatters many a sandy wrestling place of rhetoric.' 906 ἄστεία refers especially to a happy use of metaphor. In this play 939-944 would be a good instance.

F. W. HALL.

MERRILL'S CATULLUS.

Catulli Veronensis liber. Recensuit ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL. One vol. Foolscape 8vo. Pp. viii + 92. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1923. Paper, about 1s. 4d.

THE publisher asked Professor Merrill to make his notes as short as possible; 'quam ob rem' says he 'uarias lectiones meliorum codicum Catullianorum neque omnes (uel fere omnes), ut olim mihi proposui, neque multas in calce paginarum exhibere possum.' That is not so: there is ample room in his notes for every MS variant which a student really needs to know; but this room is otherwise occupied, and half the ship's

cargo has been thrown overboard to save the bilge-water.

By his own rule the apparatus criticus of Catullus is to be constructed 'ex O (O² raro) GRK² solis, neglectis quae uaria MM²G² et omnes alii intulerint'; yet I have counted some 30 occurrences of G² alone. Again, he will squander his precious space at this rate: 75 3 'uelle queat tibi La. uelleque tot tibi V uelle queam tibi ω': tibi three times where it should not appear at all and uelle where it need not; 'queat La., queam iam ω, -que tot V' would tell all that wants telling. But his main purpose in withholding indispensable in-

formation and deceiving the reader by silence is to find room for a long record of conjectures which dishonour the human intellect. A brilliant and celebrated emendation like Schrader's *Eous* at 62 35 he cannot mention, nor such shrewd and thoughtful proposals as *deprendis* *ibid.*, *Africis* 48 5, *saluete bonarum* 64 23b, *acta* 116 7; he prefers the worst conjectures of the worst critics. When I say that more than 60 proceed from Robinson Ellis and nearly 30 from his disciples, their average quality can be imagined. At 64 359 'iter caesis angustans corporum acervus' there should either be no note or this note, '*cessis* O, *celsis* Bae.': what we find instead is '*caecis* (coll. *Ou. met.* I 24) Ell.', a conjecture whose proper place is not the pillory but the grave; and at 64 207 more than a line is sacrificed to registering a proposal of the same character and authorship. It would have been better to leave a blank at 98 6 than to fill it with Mr Hendrickson's conjecture, 'if you want to be the death of us all you need only split'. The notes on 80 are these: '4 e V de Ell. (ex te D). 7 fictoris Ell. (coll. Non. 308)'. In both verses the text is faultless; the one conjecture is based on nothing but a preference for bad MSS, and the absurdity of the other is not redeemed by its obscenity; yet for their sweet sake we must forgo the knowledge that in 8 the MSS have *ille te mulso*, and the critics who restored *ilia et emulso* must be robbed of the credit due to them. The difficulties of 10 9 sq. can be removed by writing '*nihil neque ipsis | nunc* (Westphal) *quaestoribus* (Muretus) *esse nec cohorti*': the corrections are not certain, but they are sensible. Mr Merrill quotes instead —no, he misquotes, as Ellis did before him¹—Traube's slapdash conjecture '*mihi neque ipsi* (thus much is Estaço's) [*hoc praetore fuisse nec cohorti*]', which is shown to be false by verses 12 sq.,

and he adds two more which are not much better. At 10 33 '*sed tu insulsa male et molesta uiuis*' he has no room to say what the MSS give instead of *insulsa*, yet room for such frivolity as '*niuis O cuiuis Monse abibis* Busche'. At 64 273 '*leuiterque sonant*' he neither mentions that G omits *que* nor tells us whether or no R omits it, but cites three conjectures, one of them impossible. At 66 12 '*uastatum finis iuerat Assyrios*' his note is '*iuerat ante Syros Ow.*' instead of '*uastum V.*' At 64 89 he prints the conjecture *progignunt*, and in the note, instead of the MS reading, another conjecture.

The book teems with *suggestio falsi*. A bare text without notes is not deceptive, because the reader knows his ignorance and suspends belief; but these notes perpetually encourage him to wrong conclusions. At 1 8 he finds *habe tibi* in the text and '*tibi habe V*' in the note. When therefore at 23 13 and 39 3 and 64 334 and 66 85 and 68 160 he finds *magis aridum* and *orator excitat* and *tales unquam* and *dona leuis bibat* and *dulce mihi* in the text and nothing in the notes, how can he fail to infer that the MSS give the words in this order? how can he suspect that they really give *aridum magis* and *excitat orator* and *unquam tales* and *leuis bibat dona* and *mihi dulce*? When at two of the three places where Tethys occurs he is told that the MSS call her Thetis, what inference but a false one can he draw from the silence of the note at 64 29? When at 4 3 '*neque ullius natantis impetum trabis*' he reads '*illius V*', how can he help concluding that if V had *tardis* for *trabis* he would be warned of it? When such a trifle as the variant *tum* for *tunc* is recorded at 64 56, how can he conceive that this editor has left him ignorant in places where the MSS have *tamen* . . . *est* for *tum* . . . *es*, *uocare cura* for *uocaret aura*, *posse* for *se*, *inimica* for *minuta*, *luci* for *iugi*, *adlenire* for *aduenere*, *nicens* a for *moenia*, *Pharsaliam* for *Pharsalum*, *tum* for *nunc*, *tuos* for *talos*, *currus* for *tauros*, *pro* for *me*, *numula* for *lumina*, *deficeret* for *desideret*, *corpore* for *torpor*, *inquam* for *ni quem*? At 66 50 '*ferri fingere duritiem*' the only note is '*fingere O fringere GR stringere Hey.*' The reason

¹ Mr Merrill's dependence on Ellis is almost ludicrous. 64 23 '*dein spatium quinquaginta fere litterarum* (Ell.)': our informant is Keil, and Ellis merely substituted a round number for Keil's '*quadraginta octo*'. When Ellis appropriates the conjectures of others, 31 5, 55 9, 64 273, 350, Mr Merrill repeats the false ascription

why Heyse made his conjecture, and why most editors accept it, is that the MSS have not *ferri* but *ferris*. Such deficiency in craftsmanship or care or sense is not distinguishable by its consequences from malice aforethought and an intent to deceive.

The editor's own conjectures at 55 9 and 68 118 call for no remark except that the one is violent and that half of the other is not his; but at 64 16 he relegates to the note proposals of Lachmann's and Friedrich's which yield reasonable sense, and prints in the text his own, which is 'illa (*ecquanam alia?*) uiderunt luce . . . mortales . . . nymphas'. The answer to this injudicious question is *yes*: Hom. *Il.* XVIII 35-145, Ap. Rh. IV 930-67, etc.

Mr Merrill has special disqualifications for editing a poet. At 62 63 he prints an hexameter beginning 'tertia patri pars', and boasts in his note 'sic scripsi'. At 52 2 'sella in curuli struma Nonius sedet' he says '*nonius* V fortasse recte'; and therefore, though he does well to keep *Fuficio* out of the text at 54 5, he will not be suspected of knowing the quantity of its second syllable. Whatever his partiality for the Ellisian type of conjecture, he would hardly have cited *fraglans* 6 8 and *tablam* 63 9 if he had been aware that they are unmetrical. On p. VII, under the heading *prosodia Catulli*, he says 'diastole bis apparet (64 360 *tepēfaciet*; 90 6 *liquefaciens*: sed cf. 68 29 *tepēfactet*)': the *ē* was original and *tepēfactet* is systole. He adds to his preface a couple of pages on *metra Catulli* 'quae tironibus auxilio sint'. German tiros can learn metre from experts; it is in Mr Merrill's country and mine that tiros are instructed by their fellow-tiros. On the continent of Europe even a tiro may

smile to see the Galliambic chopped up into trochees and tribrachs diversified with dactyls and *μακρὰν τριχρονον*. 'Versus Galliambicus' says Mr Merrill 'ex origine tetrameter Ionicus a minore catalecticis esse adfirmatur'. *adfirmatur* indeed! It is Ionic, and no metrist mistakes it for anything else; it is as thoroughly known as the dactylic hexameter and much simpler than the iambic senarius. Competent authority speaks with one voice, and provokes a babel of dissent from the Anglo-Saxon race, which will not study metre and yet presumes to have opinions upon it. Error by its very nature is manifold, and the dissenters dissent from one another: where Mr Merrill finds trochees and dactyls, Dr Postgate (*Prosodia Latina* p. 104), who calls the verse composite, finds iambi and anapaests, and R. Y. Tyrrell (*C.R.* 1893 p. 44), who calls it antispastic, finds all four. To Catullus the Phalaecean hendecasyllable was probably also Ionic, as it was to Varro and Quintilian and as it evidently is in Soph. *Ai.* 634 and 645. Mr Merrill scans it on Hermann's system, which is already discarded by Hermann's compatriots; but Parisian fashions have a second life in Bayswater, and this scansion, congenial to British and American notions, is sure of a refuge under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes. Mr Merrill's scheme of the iambic scazon is another obsolete piece of apriorism, to which he adds an error of his own by allowing a long syllable in the ninth place.

There is given a *conspectus editorum*, including Bentley, Bergk, Buecheler, Burman, and many more who never edited Catullus in their lives; Rossbach, who did, is omitted, and *Ro.* stands for Mr K. Rossberg.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

PLATO'S LETTERS.

Die Briefe Platons. Herausgegeben von ERNST HOWALD. Zürich, 1923. Now that Wilamowitz has joined the company of those who maintain the authenticity of at least the seventh and eighth of the letters handed down in the Academy as Plato's, it was to be expected that younger scholars would be

tempted to cultivate this almost virgin soil. As the present editor observes in his Preface, 'the genuine letters of Plato produce the effect of an unexpected find from the sands of Egypt.' On the general question of the thirteen epistles appended to the Academic edition of Plato's works, I have said

what I have to say elsewhere,¹ and I need not repeat it now. I shall only call attention to one or two points which are not satisfactorily dealt with in this edition. Howald regards Epistles VI., VII. and VIII. as undoubtedly genuine, and he very properly defends even the 'epistemological' section of VII. That is to say, he accepts considerably more than half of the traditional corpus; for these three letters are the longest and the most important. It follows that, if we are to condemn the remaining ten with any confidence, we must explain how they came to be included in the Academic edition at least as early as the second century B.C., especially as the subscription to Epistle XII. (*ἀντιλέγεται ὡς οὐ Πλάτωνος*) amounts, on the principle of *exceptio probat regulam*, to a statement that none of the others were disputed. That does not prove, of course, that they are genuine; for the Academic editors of the Platonic dialogues certainly admitted one or two compositions of the third century B.C.; but they meant to be critical, as is shown by the fact that they relegated half-a-dozen dialogues to an appendix of *νοθεύόμενοι*. It is not the case, then, that the authenticity of each epistle has to be established independently. It is true rather to say that there is a presumption of authenticity, and that the burden of proof is on those who dispute it.

Now I do not suppose any one will ever be persuaded that Epistle I. could possibly have been written by Plato, and that, of course, makes a bad impression at the very outset. On the other hand, it must be observed that there is not a word in the letter itself to suggest that it was written by Plato. That rests altogether on the superscription, and there are good grounds for holding that the superscriptions are due to the Academic editor. It is curious at least that while the letters to Archytas are headed *Ἀρχύτα Ταπρύνῳ*, the only form which occurs in the body of the letters (in XIII. as well as in VII.) is *Ἀρχύτης*. On the other hand, Epistle

II. and Epistle XIII., to take only these, undoubtedly profess to be Plato's; and, if they are not, they are deliberate forgeries, though the language in which they are written shows that they belong to the fourth century B.C. That is surely a very difficult hypothesis.

The chief stumbling-block in Epistle II. seems to be the sentence—

διὰ ταῦτα οὐδὲν πάποτ' ἐγὼ περὶ τούτων γέγραφα, οὐδ' ἔστιν σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἔσται, τὰ δὲ νῦν λεγόμενα Σωκράτους ἐστὶν καλοῦ καὶ νέου γεγονότος (314c).

I have been quite unable to make out what Howald (or, for the matter of that, Wilamowitz) supposes this sentence to mean, but surely it is quite simple. Plato is warning Dionysius that he must not expect to find a full statement of the mature Platonic philosophy in the published *Σωκρατικοὶ λόγοι*. On any possible theory, that is surely obvious, and the last clause means 'What now go by the name of Plato's writings belong to a beautified and rejuvenated Socrates.' I take this to refer to the fact that most of Plato's dialogues represent Socrates as he was, or as he might be imagined, at a time before Plato was ten years old or even before he was born, not as the elderly man whom Plato actually knew.² Howald's note is mysterious. He says that this is the Socrates who would be an old, old man (*uralt, steinalt*) if he were still living, whereas in the dialogues he is younger than he would be now. No one, he adds, will excite himself for the view that *Σωκράτης ὁ νεώτερος*, whom we know from the *Theaetetus* and its sequels and from Aristotle, is meant, and he confesses that he was tempted to read *Ἰσοκράτους*!

With regard to Epistle XIII., it seems to be felt that it is somehow unworthy of a 'philosopher,' who ought to be above such mundane considerations as sending presents to his hostess and her children, and asking to be remembered to the people he played

¹ *Greek Philosophy, Part I., Thales to Plato* (Macmillan, 1914), § 157.

² As I have been strangely accused of representing Plato as a sort of Boswell, may I point out that this is the great difference? The dialogues dealing with the trial and death of Socrates form, of course, a class by themselves.

tennis with (συμφαιρισταί). To me it seems a very human document indeed, and it only increases my respect and admiration for the great Athenian. The financial details, which shock some people so much, impress me as intended to convey just such a dignified, but decided, snub as a gentleman might permit himself in writing to a spoilt princeling who thought it beneath him to trouble about his pecuniary obligations. I do not at all understand what Howald means by talking about the

schmutzige Vertraulichkeiten of the letter.

However, this book is welcome as a sign of the times, and it is a thankless task to pick holes in it. It is more important to call attention to the fine piece of work that still awaits some young scholar who will take the trouble to master the history of Sicily in the fourth century, and who will prepare himself for editing the *Epistles* by first assimilating the *Timaean* and the *Laws*.

JOHN BURNET.

CHRISTIANS AND PAGANS IN THE GRAECO-ROMAN LEVANT.

Licht vom Osten. Von ADOLF DEISSMANN. Vierte, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage, mit 83 Abb. im Text. Pp. xvii + 447. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923.

Lettere cristiane dai Papiri greci del III. e IV. Secolo. Di GIUSEPPE GHEDINI. Pp. xxviii + 376. Milano: Presso l'amministrazione di 'Aegyptus,' 1923.

The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography. By the REV. F. X. J. EXLER. Pp. 141. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1923.

FAR from being a reprint of the second and third edition, well known in England in the translation of L. R. M. Strachan, the fourth edition of Professor Deissmann's *Licht vom Osten* is a brave attempt, against heavy odds, to bring this most useful book up to date. For this purpose Professor Deissmann has succeeded in utilising, with a fulness which represents a real triumph over insuperable difficulties, the epigraphical and papyrological material published in Germany and abroad since 1909; and he has been helped by the special studies both of others and of his own pupils, such as the illuminating paper on 'Der Attizismus und das Neue Testament,' published by W. Michaelis in *Zeitsch. f. nt. Wissensch.*, 1923, p. 91 ff. The book has been revised and added to throughout, and the new illustrative material represented in the illustrations alone includes the Quirinius inscriptions and the Δούκιος-Δουκᾶς pair from Pisidian Antioch, the *lytron* inscription of Kula, the epitaph

of the Roman Jewess Regina, and the *diptychon* of Valerius Quadratus from the Fayûm, as well as a number of documents on papyrus. The omission of one of the most instructive of 'illustrative' inscriptions, the Zeus-Hermes dedication of Sedasa, near Lystra, is the more to be regretted that it was published in time to be mentioned in a footnote to the English translation of the third edition (p. 280).¹ Too late for inclusion in the present edition appeared the Ephesian inscription of Phlegethius (circa A.D. 441), Count of the Domestici and Proconsul of Asia, who reminds the people of Smyrna that they deserve punishment, and goes on: διὰ δὲ τὰς ἐκβοήσεις ταύτης τῆς λαμπρᾶς Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως καὶ οὐ δὲ αὐτῶν τὰς δεήσεις τὸ καθόλου παρακροῦσθαι, ἀπολύομεν ὑμᾶς κτλ. (Grégoire, *Recueil, etc.*, No. 100⁸; *Anatolian Studies pres. to Ramsay*, p. 154 ff.). This text should be added to the papyrus of the Prefect of Egypt, Septimius Vegetus (A.D. 85: ἄξιός μὲν ἦς μαστιγωθῆναι . . . χαρίζομαι δέ σε τοῖς ὄχλοις), quoted by D. (p. 229) to illustrate the procedure of Pontius Pilate (βουλόμενος ποιῆσαι τὸ ἱκανὸν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββάν). The action of these two Roman officials in the Greek East at

¹ This inscription (see *Class. Rev.*, 1910, p. 76) was revised by the writer in June, 1910, when the restoration Δι' Ἠλίου was observed to fit the broken traces in the last line exactly. The natives said that no ancient stones were found at Balyklagho, and that the nearest sites yielding ancient stones were at Serai and Ak Kilisse, the latter an hour distant in a straight line. This inscription doubtless belongs to Ak Kilisse.

an interval of centuries suggests that Pilate's procedure was neither fabulous nor capricious. In the confident hope that Professor Deissmann's courage and energy will rise to a fifth edition, which the resumption of excavation and exploration in the Near East is certain to necessitate before long, the writer ventures to offer a few suggestions on the new epigraphical sections of the book, with which alone he is competent to deal.

On the Quirinius inscriptions a somewhat fuller statement of their bearing on the problem of Luke's chronology would be advisable (p. 5). The question is still *sub iudice*; and if Dessau's view of the date of these inscriptions (referred to by D.) is correct, they cease to have any bearing on the question of the date of Quirinius' first governorship of Syria. The argument would have to fall back on the Egyptian census papers and on the dated Augustan milestones of the Pisidian military roads. One of the latter, which St. Paul certainly saw with his own eyes, and which still stands where he passed it, might well find a place in this book. The *lytron* inscription of Kula (p. 278) has been correctly transcribed by W. H. Buckler (*A.B.S.A.*, 1914-16, p. 181 ff.), who explains Γαλλικῶ as a feminine proper name, like Καλλιστώ, Ἰερῶ, etc., and clears away an unwarranted epithet of the god Mên. The two inscriptions from the *Hieron* near Antioch, which prove that in one case the forms Λούκιος and Λουκάς were applied to a single individual, ought not to be adduced (as on p. 372 ff.) as a proof that St. Luke's formal name was Lucius. It is highly probable that it was; but neither can there be any doubt that Λουκάς was short for Lucanus, Lucianus, possibly even Lucilius, as well as Lucius; and these inscriptions have exactly the same relevance to the problem as one proving the equivalence of Λουκάς and Lucanus would have. The real argument for Lucius as against Lucanus as the formal name of the Evangelist is the frequency of the former and the rarity of the latter name in the Greek East at this period. Professor Deissmann finds unnecessary difficulty (p. 447) in the reading of the New Jersey goblet inscription, εὐφραίνου

ἐφ' ὃ πάρις (which its editor, Gisela M. A. Richter, translated, "Rejoice in that in which Paris rejoiced"; that is, in the beauty of women'). D. correctly connects this with the formula εὐφραίνου ἐφ' ὃ πάρις on a goblet in Wiegand's possession (p. 104); πάρις is for πάρις; the use of the Epic and Ionic form εἰς can be paralleled from Hellenistic inscriptions.

It may seem 'kleinlich' to insist on minor flaws in a book which has already established itself as the indispensable companion of students of 'New Testament Greek' in all lands; but the next edition is an event in which we are all interested, and in this edition Professor Deissmann's historical sense is sometimes displayed to less advantage than his delicate perception in matters of language and style.

In their public writings Aelius Aristides and Tertullian in the later second century are no less explicit on the subject of their religious belief than Julian and Basil in the later fourth. But if we knew the two former only from their tombstones, it is by no means certain that we should be able to distinguish them as a pagan and a Christian. Among the 'private' documents of the first three centuries the distinction between pagan and Christian authorship is notoriously difficult to draw. After Constantine's legalisation of Christianity in A.D. 312, open profession of Christianity became both safe and fashionable. Prior to A.D. 312 the average unheroic Christian had perforce to declare his faith, if he declared it at all, in cryptic language or through a secret symbolism. The Christian epigraphist has long been familiar with this characteristic of the earliest Christian epitaphs. But tombstones were set up for all to read; and the epigraphist might reasonably approach a collection of Christian private letters in the expectation that their very privacy would encourage greater freedom of profession. A perusal of Ghedini's most welcome little book will undeceive him. The 'privacy' of private letters varies from society to society and from government to government. It is clear from the documents collected in this book that

the average Christian of the second and third centuries took no greater risks in his private correspondence than he took in erecting the family gravestone. Further, Christians and pagans lived in the same society, shared a common fund of ideas and interests, inherited the same literary and artistic forms. In the 'private' documents of the fourth century a distinctive Christian phraseology has been developed, and presently becomes stereotyped. In the earlier period we find in the Christian letters the same subtle and guarded deviations from pagan phraseology as we find in the inscriptions, the same growing preference for Biblical or significant names, the same avoidance of language in any way associated with pagan religious ideas. Working on the same kind of material as the epigraphist, the 'Christian papyrologist' uses tools similar to those forged by De Rossi, and his results show the same progression from tentativeness and probability in the later second century to certainty in the later third.

It is not without significance that Ghedini's bibliography contains no reference to the work of De Rossi, Le Blant, and Ramsay, or even to Lefebvre's collection of the Christian Greek inscriptions of Egypt. He has in fact omitted, in an otherwise admirable treatise, to lay sufficient emphasis on the important historical conclusions to which, by converging paths in neighbouring fields, papyrological and epigraphical studies lead. His book contains the text of forty-four Egyptian Greek letters, most of them certainly, and all of them probably, Christian, and ranging in date from the end of the second century to the beginning of the fifth, with introduction, translations, notes, and indices. The introduction illustrates, by statistical comparison of pagan and Christian letters at different periods, the rapid spread of Christianity in Egypt, and discusses the bearing of the Christian letters on Christian terminology, organisation, and ethics. The

notes are judicious, and the indices full and varied. The book rests on a wide knowledge of the work of non-Latin scholars, British as well as German, on papyrology and Hellenistic grammar. While the author's interests are mainly linguistic, the real interest of this collection of early Christian letters is historical rather than linguistic. Ghedini's book ought to be translated into English, where it would find suitable philological companionship in Milligan's *Selections from the Papyri*, and would represent Italian scholarship in the Early Christian field more worthily than Marucchi's very parochial *Manual of Christian Epigraphy*.

Without such preliminary studies as that of Dr. Exler on the *Form of the Ancient Greek Letter*, such works as the two noticed above could not be written. This Dissertation for the Doctorate of the Catholic University of America consists of an examination of all the Egyptian Greek letters contained in the principal collections of papyri, in respect of their opening formulae, closing formulae, and some of the conventional phrases used in the body of the letter, such as the type, 'I write you these few lines to let you know that I am well, hoping you are the same,' the illiteracy formula, and the oath formula. These formulae are classified according to date (with a sub-classification in the case of the opening formulae, according as they occur in familiar letters, business letters, petitions or official letters); and the author is able to exhibit the period of currency of each variety, from the third century B.C. to the third and fourth century A.D., and to bring out clearly subtle changes in epistolary fashion. There is also a section on the dating of letters, and a handy index. It adds to the usefulness of the book that the formulae are quoted in full throughout. The printing and proof-reading are as creditable to the press as this very competent piece of work is to its author.

W. M. CALDER.

TWO BOOKS ON PHILODEMUS.

The Rhetorica of Philodemus. Translation and Commentary by HARRY M. HUBBELL, Ph.D. (Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. 23. Pp. 243-382.) New Haven, Connecticut, 1920. \$1.20.

Philodemos : über die Gedichte, Vtes Buch : Griechischer Text mit Übersetzung und Erläuterungen. Von CHRISTIAN JENSEN. One vol. 8vo. Pp. xii + 178. Berlin : Weidmann, 1923. 3s. 10d.

THE study of the Herculanæum Papyri has shown a strong tendency to become the monopoly of German scholars, though the Italians have never completely relaxed their hold of the treasure. The incursion of an American scholar into this field is therefore in itself a welcome novelty.

The title of Dr. Hubbell's work is doubly misleading. In the ordinary sense of the words, what he gives us is neither a translation nor a commentary. An introductory essay and bibliography are followed by an abridged paraphrase of the text of Philodemus' two works on Rhetoric as presented by Sudhaus in the three Teubner volumes. A good many alternative restorations and emendations are taken from periodical literature, and some new ones are suggested. Further, the order of the papyri, which were not arranged consecutively by Sudhaus, is rectified, and the order of fragments within each papyrus is frequently varied in accordance with the apparent demands of the argument. In this way the whole of Sudhaus' material is used (with the exception of passages deemed 'hopeless'), but much of it is very severely abbreviated, even where the restoration is certain and translation not particularly difficult. So much of the 'translation.' There is no systematic commentary, but there is a minimum of footnotes explanatory of the paraphrase, and there is a concluding Excursus on the Rhetorical controversies of the time.

The Rhetorical writings, though in some ways the most important (chiefly by their mere bulk), are by no means the most interesting of Philodemus' works. It is therefore a little unfortunate that Dr. Hubbell has treated

them with the idea chiefly of bringing out the line of argument followed. This is perhaps the least interesting thing about them, and it is also their most easily discovered feature. Dr. Hubbell says he hoped to make these writings 'more accessible to the general reader,' but can general readers in America be credited with an interest in ancient rhetoric so great that they value these obscure and verbose pages for their own sake? Even scholars, if they value them at all, value them chiefly for the sidelights thrown on Epicurean doctrine and terminology, or on the development of the Greek language. In these regions Dr. Hubbell's work gives little or no help. Hardly any other Epicurean text in even cited, and the reader of Philodemus who turns to this work when in difficulties with the Greek will nearly always find that he has hit on a passage in which the condensation is specially severe.

This work, therefore, though meritorious, is of very limited utility, and modesty should have prevented its author from saying of the work of that fine scholar, the late Siegfried Sudhaus, that its value is 'almost nullified by glaring faults in arrangement and presentation.' The faults of arrangement in Sudhaus' volumes are of course glaring—so glaring that no more intelligence is required to correct them than understanding to excuse them.

The *περὶ ποιημάτων* of Philodemus constitutes the second largest group of papyri in the remains of the Herculanæan library. The Catalogues allot to it no fewer than seventeen papyrus numbers, and among these are some of the best preserved rolls. So far only half-hearted attempts have been made to reconstruct it. Hausrath's attempt on Book II. (*Jahrb. f. kl. Phil.*, 1889) was ill-conceived and faulty in execution. Its greatest success was that it provoked Gomperz to vindicate for Philodemus papyri 994 and 1676 and to publish restorations of large portions of these rolls (*Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, 1891). In regard to the remainder of the surviving material

Poin
Bl
Tr
Co
ma
net
PROF
the A
reven
by the
tion
Pelas
tised
'Erin
tently
still f
the co
NO.

practically the only help available for the student is the published Naples and Oxford transcripts.

Professor Jensen of Kiel, a pupil of Sudhaus, already well known for admirable work in this field, published in 1919, through the Berlin Academy, a study called *Neoptolemos und Horaz*, containing a reconstruction of cols. 1-13 of pap. 1425, the most perfect of those not previously edited. The present work is a development of that study. The first half is a restoration with a translation of pap. 1425. The second half consists of three essays: 'Neoptolemos und Horaz' (reprinted with some alterations from the *Abhandlung* of 1919); (2) on the *Poetics* of the Stoic Ariston of Chios; (3) on the *Poetics* of Crates of Pergamum.

The reconstruction is carried out after the best recent examples. The Oxford and Naples transcripts are given in facsimile beside the editor's text, and a fourth column contains a German translation. Dr. Jensen is able to supplement the evidence of the transcripts by his own collation (not quite complete, we gather) of the original. As a result we have 38 columns of almost continuously intelligible prose.

A study of the explanatory matter confirms the value of this result. The first essay deals with frs. 1 and 2 and cols. 1-13 and shows that Philodemus is arguing against views which Horace

had advocated in his *Ars Poetica*, Horace's source being Neoptolemus of Parium. The second essay deals with the middle section (cols. 13, 28-21, 22), and shows that Philodemus is here combating Ariston of Chios, who was almost more a Cynic than a Stoic, and criticised poetry from a strictly moral or educational standpoint. The last essay examines the concluding section and attempts to reconstruct, mainly from the evidence afforded by Philodemus' not always intelligent criticisms, the literary theories of Crates of Pergamum, developing issues which promise to be of great importance for the history of ancient literary criticism.

The book as a whole is of the nature of an interim report by Professor Jensen on the progress of his great task of editing the *Poetics* of Philodemus. He begins here with Book V.; and apparently he intends to deal next with Book II. He seems to us to have laid in the present volume a firm foundation for his further work, and to have shown conclusively that the very laborious task which he has set himself is not only one that he is exceptionally well fitted to perform, but also one of great importance, which the learned world should assist and encourage in every possible way. We hope that the present troubles in Germany will not impede the continuation of a work so auspiciously begun.

J. L. STOCKS.

THE LAW OF HOMICIDE IN GREECE.

Poigne. A Study in Ancient Greek Blood-Vengeance. By HUBERT J. TRESTON, M.A., Professor of Classics, Cork. Pp. ix+427. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1923. £1 1s. net.

PROFESSOR TRESTON's theory is that the Achaeans allowed individual blood-revenge—i.e., the slaying of the slayer by the kin of the slain, without molestation of his innocent relatives. The Pelasgians, on the other hand, practised weregelt, and also believed in the 'Erinyes,' whose *n* the author persistently doubles. This was complicated still further in the seventh century by the coming of Apolline religion, which

brought with it the conception of impurity arising from manslaying—a proposition which Professor Treston many times asserts, but, perhaps wisely, never tries to prove in detail. The final result was the laws of homicide prevailing in historical Greece, especially Athens.

The story of the effect of modern views of the State and its functions upon earlier ideas, religious and juristic (if, indeed, these can be separated), is a fascinating one when adequately treated. The introduction on the one hand of severer penalties by the suppression of the practice of weregelt, on the other of the concept of justifiable

or excusable homicide, by the passing or weakening of the magico-religious horror of shed blood, if competently studied within the Greek area by a jurist who was also anthropologist and historian, might make a book which the reader would find it as hard to lay down as the reviewer found it hard to finish this one. The unfortunate fact is that the author, though when in possession of the relevant data he sometimes reasons clearly, has nothing like the equipment necessary for his task.

An examination of his list of authors in the table of contents, supplemented (for the index is defective) by the references in his footnotes, brings this clearly before us. He has to examine the evidence of Homer; he apparently has never read Caer, Drerup, Lang, van Leeuwen, or Scott. Greek religion necessarily enters largely into his argument; the omissions here include Eitrem, Farnell, Foucart, Frazer, Nillson, Roscher's *Lexikon*, Wide, and Wünsch. The works of Miss Harrison and one or two essays of Professor Murray are his staple, with Smith's excellent school dictionary of antiquities to supplement them, and one or two references to Daremberg-Saglio. Mythology is of course drawn upon, but without the guidance of Gruppe or Preller-Robert. In the department of Greek history and pre-history I have not succeeded in finding any use of Evans, the histories of Beloch and Busolt, or any of the works of Wilamowitz-Möllerndorf. He does not seem aware that several people have studied the history of the family since the days of Maine; indeed, one is led to doubt (see especially p. 136) whether he realises that 'family,' 'clan,' and 'tribe' have quite distinct meanings. His ethnology is correspondingly light-hearted. Of 'Quellengeschichte' he is so innocent that he repeatedly quotes Pollux and the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία as if they were quite independent authorities. And in his own subject of the history

of Greek law, it is strange that he mentions neither Hirzel nor Ehrenberg.

To give a full account of his defects, from gross misunderstandings and groundless assumptions down to mis-accentuations and other evidences of imperfect scholarship, would fill a number of the *Classical Review*. I give merely a sample apiece of his handling of Greek material and of the Latin authors to whom he sometimes resorts for parallels:

P. 161, after quoting the scholiast on Plato, *Laws* 865 (ὁ ἐκ Δελφῶν κομισθεὶς νόμος ἤγονε χρησμὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄκουτος ἀνελόντος τὸν φίλον) he renders, 'The law or oracle brought from Delphi regarding a man who kills his friend (i.e., fellow-citizen as distinct from a public enemy) involuntarily.' It is almost incredible that he should never have heard of the famous tale (Aelian, *Var. Hist.* III. 44), yet such appears to be the case. The particular pilgrim who on a particular occasion killed his fellow vanishes, and in his place comes the John Doe or Richard Roe of a general law.

P. 236: 'Even in Rome the State could interfere' (with the workings of *patria potestas*), 'since we find that a Decemvir ordered the arrest and imprisonment of a certain Virginius who had slain his daughter.' If he will look in Livy again he will find that Appius Claudius had just decided (wrongfully, but legally) that Verginia was not the daughter of Virginius, but the *ancilla* of his own client, who therefore alone had *potestas* over her.

I have noted scores of other blunders as bad. One makes allowance for the difficulties of a student, perhaps short of books, certainly in a disturbed country; but even from Cork, are London, Paris, and Oxford inaccessible places? That such a book should have been completed, and apparently submitted to and approved by one or two colleagues, gives an unpleasant idea of the state of letters in Ireland.

H. J. ROSE.

DIELS'S LUCRETIVS.

T. Lucretius Carus, De Rerum Natura, Lateinisch und Deutsch. VON HERMANN DIELS, Band I. One Vol. 8vo. Pp. xlv + 410. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923. 9s. 8d.

HERMANN DIELS died on June 4, 1922. He left a written request that his text of Lucretius, which was then printed up to the end of the Fourth Book, should be completed by his friend and pupil, J. Mewaldt. This pious work has been conscientiously performed.

The volume contains a critical introduction, *testimonia*, the text of the whole poem, and an *apparatus* giving very full details of the primary sources of the text. Diels also made a German prose translation; but this seems not to have been published as yet. The last sentence of the introduction apparently implies that there was also a complete commentary, but that Diels despaired of getting it published under present conditions.

Diels spared no pains to make himself acquainted with the sources of the text. Four of these he sets apart, and denies that the Italian MSS. have any independent authority. He studied O and Q in the facsimiles; he procured photographs of G and V from Copenhagen and Vienna. All these authorities are attributed by him to the ninth century. His report of the Vienna *schedae*, in particular, is fuller than any hitherto published. Diels believes that an archetype of the fourth century was copied, possibly at York, in an insular hand, in the seventh century, and that the latter is the source of all the existing MSS.

Diels felt strongly that Lucretius, whom he placed high among poets, was a lover of antiquity and contemptuous of the refinements which contemporary writers were seeking to introduce. Hence he argues that the editors have wronged their author by seeking to polish him up and smooth him down, and that traces of ancient or inconsistent spellings, preserved in the excellent MSS., should be scrupulously retained (*mordicus esse tenenda*). He has done this himself: so I. 205 begins *nihil igitur fieri*, the assumption being

that Lucretius used different spellings of the same word and did not always spell as he pronounced. Diels, of course, retains *-is* of the nom. pl. (cf. Munro on I. 808), and many other spellings which have generally been discarded.

It is well known that the *tituli* of O are of importance for the text: it is strange that they are nowhere to be found in Munro. Here each of them is printed in red (which is used a good deal throughout the volume) wherever O has it. Another novelty is the printing of final *s* where it is elided: *omnibus rebus* here takes the place of the *omnibu' rebus* with which we are familiar. Except for children, the sign of elision is surely needless.

When we turn from general principles to particular problems of the text, it is disappointing to find that Diels does not do much to solve them. Four examples from the First Book may be cited.

(i.) The MSS. give *cortus* at the end of l. 271 and *pontus* at the end of 276: most editors read *pontum* in the former line and *uentus* in the latter. Diels supposes that the words have changed places: he reads *pontum* in 271 and *cortus* (i.e., *coortus*) in 276, justifying the contraction by *coperuisse* in V. 342. This is ingenious; but it does not satisfy: one feels that *coortus* is not wanted here, and that Markland's *uentus* is beyond question the missing word in 276. But proof is impossible.

(ii.) The MSS. give l. 321 as: *inuida praeclusit speciem natura uidendi*, where *speciem* is difficult and many substitutes have been conjectured. Diels prints *aciem*. But, even if this is metrically possible in Lucretius, how is it easier to explain than *speciem*?

(iii.) There is a famous difficulty in l. 469: *namque aliud terris, aliud regionibus ipsis | euentum dici poterit . . .*

Diels writes: '*terrast temptauit*.' But such a novelty cries aloud for explanation: it is not even clear whether his *terra* is nom. or abl. Here, and elsewhere, the prose translation might be useful.

(iv.) In l. 657 Diels prints *Musae* at the end of the line. He does not refer

to Ernout, who was the first modern editor to print what is practically the reading of O (*muse*). I have indicated elsewhere the obstacles against accepting this interpretation, and shall here quote Lachmann's note *ad loc.*: 'Brixien-
ensis editio *Musae*, quo nomine Heracliti librum a quibusdam ueterum appellatum esse nullus interpretum

recordatus est, quod miror.' Lachmann resisted the temptation, and so did Munro.

Future editors of Lucretius will certainly have to take this book into account; but I do not find that it adds much to Diels's high and deserved reputation.

J. D. DUFF.

ROMAN POLITICS AND GREEK CIVILISATION.

Roman Politics: Our Debt to Greece and Rome. By FRANK FROST ABBOTT. 7½"×5". Pp. vi+177. London, Calcutta, Sydney: Harrap and Co. 5s.
Greek Life and Thought: A Portrayal of Greek Civilisation. By LA RUE VAN HOOK, Ph.D. 9"×5½". Pp. xiv+329, 46 illustrations. New York: Columbia University Press, 1923.

UNDER his ambitious title Professor van Hook has attempted to write at once a compendium of information about Greek life, literature, art, and politics upon a small scale, and at the same time to present a popular account of Greek civilisation for the benefit of the general public. The two aims are incompatible. The second implies an artistic presentation, the essential of which is selection. As a conscientious compilation of information, which is, however, readily accessible in existing handbooks, the book is not destitute of merit, but it betrays no distinction either of thought or style.

Professor Abbott, on the other hand, has the knowledge and the courage to select and generalise, and he possesses the gift of terse, clear, and attractive exposition. The result is a vigorous and interesting little essay, which is very much alive. It is possible that without some knowledge of Roman history the general reader may find some of it difficult to follow, and whether what he learns from it will invariably be 'right opinion' may perhaps be questionable. But it is certainly the kind of book—an invaluable kind—which will arouse the interest and mental activity of students, though for teaching purposes it may need supplement by amplification and possibly by criticism.

For instance, was Rome ever in any real sense governed by a democracy (pp. 1 and 52)? Again, while it may be an exaggeration to assert that the idea of the representative principle was unknown to the Romans, does not the impression conveyed by Professor Abbott give a wrong notion of its practical importance in Roman politics? On p. 13 slavery upon an industrial scale is accepted as a condition of pre-Licinian agriculture. In contrasting the character of provincial governors under the Empire with that of their predecessors, something should have been said about the senatorial career. The impression which, I think, would be conveyed by the text to a reader ignorant of the facts would be that Augustus chose governors 'on the score of honesty and fitness' (p. 34), in the same way that I understand the President of the U.S.A. chooses ambassadors—*i.e.*, without necessary reference to any previous professional training. On p. 90 the implication of the statement that the Roman magistrate was better aware of the trend of popular sentiment than the average prime minister, and could therefore be 'confidently expected to advocate progress or change,' if it had not been for his *consilium*, appears somewhat questionable. The topic of the *consilium* might well have been elaborated a little more in detail. It might, for instance, have been pointed out that the Imperial Privy Council—though the analogy was, of course, irresistible—had its origin not in what was technically a *consilium* of a magistrate, but in an informal meeting of 'the friends of Caesar.' The reason was that Augustus was not technically a magistrate. This

essential anomaly of the emperor's position might perhaps have been given greater prominence; on the other hand more factual importance, if I may so express it, is ascribed to the Dyarchy than I should personally allow to it.

There are some interesting side-lights upon the American constitution. Apparently in the U.S.A. there exist modern advocates of the exercise of popular sovereignty through 'the recall' of the magistrate upon the lines of Tiberius Gracchus *v.* Octavius.

There are some interesting, but all too brief, notes upon the continuity of Roman political ideas through the Middle Ages. 'Our Debt' is sometimes a little overstated. It is hard upon Aristotle to inform the general public (p. 54) that Cicero 'introduces the modern method of studying the organi-

sation of actual states,' not Utopias, as the basis of political theory. I am doubtful too whether the deliberate archaism of history applied to nationalist propaganda in Rumania or among the Fascisti can be regarded by the cold-blooded student of history as the product of a continuous legacy from ancient Rome.

Unlike Professor van Hook, whose bibliography, without a word of guidance or differentiation, recommends, for instance, Baikie, *Sea Kings of Crete*, and Blegen, *Korakou*, cheek by jowl to the inquiring general reader, Professor Abbott gives an admirably select list of useful books. Its brevity is its virtue; but perhaps room might be found in it for Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, in Section III., and Heitland, *Agricola*, in Section IV.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

WHITTAKER'S MACROBIUS.

Macrobius, or Philosophy, Science, and Letters in the Year 400. By THOMAS WHITTAKER. Pp. 101. Cambridge University Press, 1923. 6s. 6d. net, cloth.

OF Macrobius the general reader has hitherto possessed no satisfactory account in English. For writing such an account Mr. Whittaker has two important qualifications—enthusiasm for his author and considerable knowledge of the original texts of Neoplatonism. The former has led him to over-value Macrobius' abilities considerably. Macrobius is a simple compiler who invariably suppresses any mention of his actual authority (*cf.* Wissowa *de Macrobiani Saturnaliorum fontibus*: Diss. Breslau, 1880; ch. i.): when he copies Gellius, he mentions neither Gellius nor Gellius' source, though the latter is regularly named in the *Noctes Atticae*. For this reason I should be inclined to support Wissowa's view, that Iamblichus is the source of *Sat.* i. 17-23, against recent criticism such as that mentioned by Whittaker, p. 18, and by Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*, p. 267. Porphyry is there quoted by name (17. 70); accordingly, it is unlikely that Macrobius used him or any direct Latin copy.

It may seem pedantic to point out errors of detail in a book apparently destined for the general reader, but the following corrections must be made. On p. 9 it should be stated that the *Asclepius* is a simple translation from the Greek (*cf.* Schwabe in *Pauly-Wissowa* II. 257; Kroll, *ib.* VIII. 796). On p. 20 it should be mentioned that Iamblichus defended sacrifice, as *de mysteriis* VI. ch. 3 (*cf.* V. ch. 1), and that Julian and Sallustius followed his lead. The discussion of the Sun's predominance (p. 21) misses the religious significance entirely; that has been brilliantly explained by Cumont in *La Théologie solaire du Paganisme romain* (*Mém. prés. à l'Acad. des Inscr.*, XII. p. 447.) The remarks about the oracle given at Claros (p. 24) ignore the important work of Buresch and others, conveniently summarised by Picard, *Épiphane et Claros*, p. 715. The observation that 'Emperor-worship was never serious for religion in Europe' (p. 36) is surprising. This Emperor-worship was the religious symbol of the unity of the Empire, and introduced to the West the conception of the divinity that hedges a king. Its survivals in Byzantine court-ceremonial and in official phraseology are obvious. I pass over

certain remarks on Homer (p. 45). On p. 58 there should be a reference to Julian's *Oratio in Cynicum Heracium*. 215 B. Lastly, in a view of a footnote on p. 96 it must be stated that there is no possibility that 'the historical

Longinus wrote the treatise *On the Sublime*': Rhys Roberts' preface dismisses that hypothesis finally.

This book is well printed and attractively produced, and should interest the general reader. A. D. NOCK.

THE GLORY THAT WAS GREECE.

Our Hellenic Heritage. By H. R. JAMES, M.A. Vol. II., Part III: Athens—her Splendour and her Fall. Pp. vi + 288. Macmillan, 1922. 4s. 6d.

THIS, the second volume of Mr. James's work, is well up to the level of the first. The author, with rare lapses, writes clearly and vigorously and with an enthusiasm for his subject which must always be an engaging quality when the subject is Athens. He is to the best of my observation, very accurate. He has on the whole well succeeded in combining the quarrelsome virtues of lucidity and conciseness. All this goes to make an excellent book for its purpose, which is not to instruct the learned. Not the least of the author's merits is the general soundness of his historical judgments; he wisely follows Thucydides and such modern English authorities as have most closely followed Thucydides, and does not deal in what the conservative-minded call 'theories.'

Still he might have mentioned at least one. Everybody will recognise the necessity under which Mr. James lay of disengaging from his book disputed points which could only perplex the beginner. But even the beginner ought to know something more than Mr. James tells him of the economic factor in the Peloponnesian War—a factor certainly of great importance, although personally I should be disposed to agree that Mr. Cornford and Mr. Grundy have overestimated it. Even in his bibliography (which of course does not profess to be exhaustive) Mr. James does not mention *Thu-*

cydides Mythistoricus or *Thucydides and his Age*. Again, it seems a pity that, in drawing so much from writers like Bury and Zimmern, he omits to mention, what they themselves have always frankly admitted, a considerable debt to German scholars like Wilamowitz and Eduard Meyer. It is not a question of originality—Bury and Zimmern are both original men—but of fair play.

If, as seems probable enough, the book should reach a second edition, the author may correct the error or misprint of *Bendidaca* on p. 100, of *lay* on p. 220, of *Dickenson* on p. 269. It does not appear at all necessary to suppose that the mass of iron sunk in the sea by the Ionians was 'hot' (p. 29). And among the legends connected with Thebes Mr. James has forgotten the story of Heracles. I wish he would not use the word 'morale' in the sense of the French *moral*, even if everybody does it. 'Another aspect of the transformation of the Athenian confederacy into an Athenian dominion was the judicial' (p. 56) is a good example of how not to write; and I do not know that the statement which follows, that the 'Athenian citizens acquired a remarkable judicial competency' is much better. At the foot of p. 60 and the top of 61 there is a rather eloquent, but vexatiously confusing, if not confused, sentence. These things can be easily changed.

The book is pleasant to handle and easy to read; the illustrations, especially of Athens, are excellent.

J. A. K. THOMSON.

LATIN WORD-ORDER.

L'Ordre des Mots dans la Phrase latine :

I. Les Groupes nominaux. Par J. MAROUCHEAU. Pp. viii + 236. Paris: E. Champion, 1922. Fr. 30.

IN this valuable contribution to a subject which until recently was less studied than its importance and the interest shown in it by ancient rhetoricians merited, M. Marouzeau wins the reader's good will by writing not only a learned but a readable monograph, at least proving that he has learned what style is before setting out to discuss a delicate point in its technique. He confines himself for the present to the group formed by a substantive and an adjective, adjectival genitive, participle, or the like; the other parts of speech will doubtless be discussed in his second volume. His results are briefly as follows: All such groups have a normal order, sometimes adjective-substantive, as is generally the case with what he calls qualificative adjectives (*magnus uir, summa constantia, aequo animo*, and many others), sometimes substantive-adjective, as is usually the case with determinatives (*homo Romanus, lingua Latina, uia militaris*). From this order it is possible to depart in two ways, firstly by inversion (*Romana lingua*), secondly by disjunction (*modus agri non ita magnus*), besides the combination of these methods. Such an alteration is very rarely indifferent. To take one or two of his simplest examples: *lingua Romana* means much the same as *lingua Latina*; but *Romana lingua* means 'the dialect of Rome,' as opposed to the country speech; *cohors una* is 'a cohort,' *una cohors* 'a single cohort.' *Mirificus homo* is a stale compliment; but Cicero, by inversion and disjunction, makes it a sincere bit of praise and the worn-out *mirificus casus* into a forcible expression of surprise: *uoramus litteras cum homine mirifico (ita mehercule sentio)* *Dionysio* (*Att.* IV. II. 2):

casus uero mirificus quidam interuenit (*Fam.* VII. 5. 2).

There can be little doubt that the method is sound as far as it goes, given one of M. Marouzeau's learning and taste to handle it. Whether it is adequate in all cases is another question. He defines a group (p. 6) in no hesitating terms: *le groupe est défini essentiellement par l'appartenance syntaxique*. To this he clings throughout, paying little attention to the other group, that which exists for the ear. In the view of the reviewer, there are passages where this method fails him. Thus, Cicero, *de orat.* I. 231: *imitatus est homo Romanus et consularis ueterem illum Socratem*. The author would presumably agree that *ueterem* is emphatic by disjunction; but surely *Romanus* and *consularis* are also emphatic; yet it is hard to see how they can be on his principles, for *homo Romanus* is the common order, *homo* (or more usually *uir*) *consularis* is equally so. But if we neglect his syntactical group and take the rhetorical ones, so to call them—i.e., the two commata into which the rhythm *-manus et consularis* (V 3) divides the period—we have the clearest possible arrangement. It is a pretty chiasmus, *imitatus est . . . Socratem: Romanus et consularis ueterem*. The two outer terms give us the main proposition, the inner ones the comment. 'He must needs ape Sokrates; he, a modern and a man of practical experience, playing at being a character out of ancient history!' Against this it would not be hard to put cases of emphatic words shown to be emphatic by M. Marouzeau's methods, where the observation of purely rhetorical groups would tell us little or nothing. Probably the true method is to combine both. Meanwhile, all interested in style, not simply those who study Latin, would do well to read this treatise.

H. J. ROSE.

FOWLER'S ROMAN LITERATURE.

A History of Roman Literature. By HAROLD N. FOWLER, Ph.D., Professor in the College for Women of Western Reserve University. Pp. x + 316; frontispiece and three other illustrations. New York: The Macmillan Company. Second edition, 1923. 14s.

THE preface to the second edition of Professor Fowler's *History of Roman Literature* up to the fifth century says it is 'little more than a reprint of the first edition,' i.e. of 1903. Minor corrections have been made, and the main alteration claimed is in the bibliography. But that is only in some measure brought up to date; for it would be easy to point out omissions of important English and French works from the list of the histories of literature, while in the list of texts, even though it does not aim at being exhaustive, it is surprising to find Caesar without Rice Holmes, Cicero without the *Oxford Classical Texts*, Calpurnius Siculus without Keene, Lucan without Haskins and Heitland, Juvenal without Mayor, and Martial without Friedländer.

The author bases his work on Teuffel, Schanz, and Dr. Mackail, and has designed it 'for use as a text-book,' giving extracts almost entirely in English, because 'Latin would probably not be read by most young readers,' and, if wanted, 'the texts of the most important works are sure to be at hand in the schools.' Although this prevailing absence of Latin makes it difficult to convey at second hand the aesthetic value of the authors, still the method is calculated to lead junior students towards a wider study of the originals, and also, it is to be hoped, to interest the ordinary reader in the sequence of Roman thought.

Of Latin writers during some seven centuries and a half the volume furnishes a competent general account, conveying criticisms which are just and sane rather than inspiring. Noticeably telling and adequate sections are those on Cicero, Horace, and Tacitus. A helpful chronological table and an index are added. The illustrative extracts are either from well-known translations or

by the author. Some of the translators are more happily chosen than others: it sounds, for instance, a particularly far cry from the spirit of the *Aeneid* to the semi-balladic verse of Conington, which wakes, unsuitably for most Virgilian moods, inevitable echoes of Scott. The English hexameter given on p. 41—

'He was the elder by birth; not all of us all things can compass'—

rings too heavy to justify the claim that the rhythm of the Latin, even if only from Lucilius (*maior erat natu: non omnia possumus omnes*), 'is retained in this translation.' Professor Fowler explains that he does not discuss the dramatic *satura* because—perhaps too summarily on a question still under debate—he takes it for proved that it never existed save as an invention in Roman literary history to correspond to the alleged origin of Greek comedy in the satyr-drama. As regards tragedy, a reader might puzzle over the disconnected statements on p. 12 that 'Cicero considered Pacuvius the greatest Roman tragic writer,' and, later, that 'the last important writer of tragedies, and probably the greatest of all, was L. Accius.'

The many judgements involved in a critical history of literature must give rise to differences of opinion. On some points I find myself at variance with Professor Fowler. When he ascribes to Maecenas 'fine literary taste . . . without talent,' I should like to modify the remark in so far as it concerns Maecenas' own attempts, which, as recorded by Seneca in one of his *Epistulae Morales*, suggest talent of a perverted sort rather than over-fine taste. Quite properly, on the other hand, Professor Fowler indicates Maecenas' service to literature as an appreciative patron of Virgil and Horace. The assertion (p. 100) that the 'only teacher whose influence (on Virgil) seems to have been lasting was the Epicurean philosopher Siro' conveys no suggestion of the presence of Stoic thought in the *Aeneid*. Again, I incline to plead for a somewhat more generous estimate of Vitruvius than that

he 'was evidently a man of no great literary education' (p. 168); for he at least advocated a wide training in liberal culture for architects. On p. 195 the chronological position of Tacitus is misleadingly stated, inasmuch as he is there, by implication, included among writers of the Flavian period, although in practice the treatment of Tacitus is correctly reserved for the reigns of Trajan. Of the *Ilias Latina*, while it is in a limited sense true to say (p. 198) that it 'is attributed to the earlier years of Silius Italicus,' a statement should be added that the attribution rests on an acrostic dependent upon textual alterations which some scholars do not accept.

Certain definite errors ought to be corrected in any future edition. It is erroneous to say of Cicero (p. 82) that 'in 50 B.C., after Pompey's flight from Italy, he exposed himself to Caesar's displeasure'; for Pompey did not leave Italy till March 49 B.C., and the letter cited in support (*Ad Att.* IX. 18) belongs to the end of that month. The voyage

of Germanicus on which Albinovanus Pedo wrote a poem took place in 16 A.D., not 16 B.C. as stated on p. 137; and the 'murder of Germanicus in 55 A.D.' (p. 178) must be meant for the murder of Britannicus. Professor Fowler is not alone in alleging that the longer parts of Petronius are 'exclusively in prose' (p. 189); but it ought to be remembered that even Trimalchio at his dinner-table breaks into verse. The name 'Herennius Priscus,' given (p. 213) as one of two eminent Stoics put to death under Domitian, looks like a cross between 'Herennius Senecio' and the subject of his eulogy, 'Helvidius Priscus.' Anyhow, this figure reappears in the Index. In the bibliography 'Gratius' occurs for 'Gratius' of the text and the Index, 'Phillimore' twice for 'Phillimore,' and 'Kerr' for 'Ker.' And—if a non-American may put the question—was it not 'The University of Pennsylvania' that issued Fairley's edition of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*?

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Antike Gewichtsnormen und Münzfüsse. By OSKAR VIEDEBANTT. Pp. vii + 166. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1923. 2s. 5d. METROLOGY is of all branches of classical study perhaps the least productive. Hultsch and Brandis were responsible for a multitude of theories which Lehmann-Haupt and others have elaborated into a structure based upon conjecture after conjecture. It is this structure which Viedebantt sets out to replace by one founded on facts rather than fancies.

The author's opponents, deriving all ancient weight-systems from Mesopotamia, had worked out a scheme so elaborate as to baffle an assessor of income-tax. Starting from a known Babylonian talent they had conjectured five additional derivative talents, and supposed each of these six forms to have been employed, either unaugmented or increased by $\frac{1}{20}$ th, $\frac{1}{10}$ th, or $\frac{1}{5}$ th. Thus there were invented twenty-four possible different talents, twenty-four minae, twenty-four shekels, and unto these were added augmentations in the second degree. Along such lines any 'standard' can be constructed and any coin fitted into a system, while it is evident that no merchant, Phoenician or Greek, could have coped with such complications.

Unfortunately these absurdities which Viedebantt has swept away still loom large in such authoritative works as Head's *Historia Numorum* and Pauly-Wissowa's *Realencyclopädie* (Suppl. Bd. III., article *Gewichte*).

On the constructive side Viedebantt produces

evidence, monumental and literary, for five systems of independent origin: the Babylonian standard, which the Persians took over; the Lydian-Anatolian, from which he would derive the Attic-Euboic; the Egyptian *Deben* system, whence came the standard of Palestine; the South Italian system, based on the Sicilian *litra*; and the North Italian, perhaps imported by the Gauls.

There is a good deal that we miss. While the theories of Lehmann-Haupt and Haeblerlin are pilloried, often with humour (a rare thing in Metrology), there is no reference to Ridgeway's valuable work—though thirty years have elapsed since he criticised the same absurdities—nor to Evans' article on *Minoan Weights and Currency* (*Corolla Numismatica*, p. 336). The Pheidonian system is barely mentioned, and the Homeric gold talent not at all. The treatment (p. 35) of the tenth chapter of Aristotle's *Ἀθ. πολ.* is hardly satisfactory, but Viedebantt's discussion of Hdt. III. 89-95 is the most valuable contribution yet made towards the solution of a much debated problem.

Not a little of his work is destructive; inevitably, since the ground must first be cleared of encumbrances; but the book is admirable for its scholarship and commonsense. Metrology stands in need of more such work.

C. T. SELTMAN.

Index Verborum C. Suetoni Tranquilli stilique eius proprietatum nonnullarum. Confeccerant Albertus Andreas Howard, Carolus Newell Jackson. Cantabrigiae Massachusettensium e typographe Academiae Harvardianae. . . . MDCCCXXII.

THIS useful book is published in this country by Humphrey Milford, price 21s. Scholars owe a debt of gratitude for it to the learned editors and to Mrs. Howard, whose name figures in the dedication. The method followed is this: Words found in express quotation from other authors are distinguished by a sloped numeral in the reference; where a quotation is in *oratio obliqua*, the words are credited to Suetonius. One might raise a theoretical objection: e.g. in *Vit. Terenti* (3) there is not much reason to doubt that the words *temperius discumberet* belong to Laelius' wife, and *successisse* to Laelius himself. But anybody that uses the book for purposes of analysing Suetonian diction can easily take care of himself, and the primary use of all such indices, a handy and complete repertory for tracing any passage of which one can recollect a single word, is not affected. Greek words are included, and a list of Greek phrases and quotations in Suetonius is added at the end. The book is excellently printed, and the price, as things go, very moderate. Altogether a valuable addition to a scholar's tools. J. S. PHILLIMORE.

Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones: latine vertit, adauxit, ad sua tempora produxit S. Eusebius Hieronymus. Edidit I. K. FOTHERINGHAM. Pp. xl+352. London: Milford, 1923. 48s. net.

STUDENTS of the lives of Latin authors know that the *Eusebius-Jerome Chronicle* is one of the ancient authorities for the facts about them, but few classical students have handled the work itself. It has not as a matter of fact been readily accessible, and until the edition by Helm was published in 1913, no satisfactory text was available. The manuscript tradition is rich, and in the Bodleian MS. *Auct. T. II.* 26 we have an authority belonging to the fifth century, the evidence of which was curiously overlooked until recent times, though it has been in the possession of the Bodleian Library for a century. The complete colotype facsimile of that manuscript, issued by the Clarendon Press under Dr. Fotheringham's editorship in 1905, was a great boon, and naturally led to the preparation of an edition by the same editor. He has since then made a complete study of the other old manuscripts, fifteen in number, and the result is now available in an edition which will satisfy all demands.

The reader will not find here the fragments of Eusebius's Greek, nor the readings of the Armenian translation, which were recently made accessible in German, nor a detailed discussion of the sources on which either the original or Jerome's translation is based.¹ These it would

be unreasonable to expect in a work of limited compass. But he has given us a masterly edition of the *Jerome Chronicle* itself, equipped with a luxurious double apparatus, one for numbers, the other for words. A long Latin preface describes the manuscripts and their interrelations. Particular attention has been paid to the original form of the *Chronicle* as Jerome prepared it, a form which has been depraved in the later manuscripts. Jerome used larger uncials for some passages, and red ink for other passages, as distinguished from the prevailing script of the archetype. These Dr. Fotheringham has imitated, with this difference that the red passages of the manuscripts are represented here in thick black type.

Dr. Fotheringham's judgment in constituting the text may be relied on nearly always. Sometimes I venture to think he has wrongly deserted the Bodleian MS., or preferred the wrong spelling. For example *seraphim*, as the proper Greek form, should be read on p. 33, l. 8. rather than the Latin and (less ancient) Greek form *seraphim* (cf. p. 41, l. 9); *zmyrna* rather than *smyrna* (p. 121); *tarsensis* rather than the much commoner but less correct *tharsensis* (p. 252: cf. p. 141); *epistulas* (with OF) rather than *epistolae* (p. 218, l. 15); *christi* rather than *Christi* (pp. 242, l. 16; 243, l. 1), as it is wrongly abbreviated in the MSS.; *palauti* rather than *palani* (p. 253, l. 23), as rightly *brundisii* (p. 247, l. 23);² *pathmum* (with OL) rather than the degenerate *pathmum* (p. 274, l. 3). As it appears from other works of Jerome that he had a decided preference for the (otherwise comparatively rare) form *moses* rather than *moyses*, and as there is generally some evidence for the form *moses* in manuscripts of the *Chronicle*, it would, I think, have been sound criticism to print *moses* everywhere. The 'index nominum' at the end of the book will enable the reader to trace most items in which he is interested, but a cross reference from the usual form (Irenaeus), in a case like 'Hireneus,' would have been helpful. As it is, wrong conclusions might be drawn from the editor's (apparent) silence. An index of the rarer words used in the narrative might have been profitably added at no great cost of space.

The book ought to receive a rapturous welcome from Latin scholars. The apparatus contains abundance of valuable material for a new, and much needed, lexicon of Latin orthography.³ A. SOUTER.

7-11) and Tertullian *Apology*, chap. V., was pointed out by Vallarsi long ago, but I am not aware that anyone has shown that Jerome's words here are the *ipsissima verba* of Tertullian, and are therefore due to himself, not to Eusebius (contrast the latter's *Hist. Eccl.* V. 5 § 6).

² It is not as well known as it ought to be that whereas single *i* is in such cases the correct form of the genitive, double *i* is the correct form of the locative (see *Thesaurus*, s.v. *Brundisium*).

³ The form *guilosom* is cited from manuscript D on p. 285. This MS., now *Paris B.N. lat.* 4860, was written at Mayence between 939 and 954. Mommsen argued that the archetype of

¹ The likeness between the passage under the 238th Olympiad (Fotheringham, p. 289, lines

Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis, being the New Testament Quotations in the Old-Latin version of the ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΠΑΤΡΟΠΗ ΨΕΥΔΩΝΥΜΟΥ ΓΝΩΣΤΕΩΣ, edited by the late WILLIAM SANDAY and CUTHBERT HAMILTON TURNER, etc. Pp. clxxxviii + 311, with collotype of one page of the Claromontane MS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. 48s. net.

IRENAEUS, bishop of Lyons, composed a number of works in his native language, which was Greek, in the period about A.D. 185. Of these the most important was a long treatise in five books, designed to refute certain Gnostic heresies of the time. Its significance for the Biblical student lies in the fact that he quoted largely and carefully both from the Old and the New Testament in Greek. No manuscript of Irenaeus in the original Greek has survived except a short fragment found at Oxyrhynchus. Considerable portions of it, however, are quoted in later authors such as Epiphanius the Cyprian, who wrote towards the close of the fourth century. The quotations thus made belong for the most part, alas! to those sections of the original where Biblical quotations are fewest.

But though the Greek tradition is so meagre and unsatisfactory, there have survived a careful Latin version of the whole work, and an Armenian translation of the fourth and fifth books. The Latin version is first quoted in one of the later works of St. Augustine (about 420), but the question of its actual date is one of some difficulty. The Armenian appears to belong to the fifth century. The fashionable view down to the publication of Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament held that the Latin translation was almost as old as the original work, seeing that Tertullian apparently made use of it. Hort, however, in a memoir which finds a place in the Sanday-Turner volume, argued forcibly against this view, and assigned this translation to the fourth century. It is obviously a matter of great importance to date the Latin translation as exactly as possible, and this can only be done by a philological argument such as that employed by the writer in the introduction to the present work.¹

The work has been so long in progress that there has been time for various important accessions to our knowledge to emerge. This fact has told somewhat on the form of the book. For instance, the Armenian version referred to was not discovered till the great bulk of the sheets had been printed off. The whole of the necessary information is to be found in this book, most laboriously and exactly recorded, but the reader may find it necessary to make cross-references for himself. Professor Turner

the MS. was a Reichenau book (*cf.* Fotheringham, p. xix). That may be; but the form just quoted indicates a Spanish stage in transmission (*cf.* the writer's *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul I.* [Cambr., 1922], pp. 253 f.).

¹ With the body of the work the present reviewer had nothing to do, since most of it was already in print before he saw it.

deserves high commendation for the editorial qualities he has lavished on the book.

A. SOUTER.

Euripidis Hypsipyla cum notis criticis et exegeticis. Ed. G. ITALIE. One vol. 8vo. Pp. xii + 80. Berlin: E. Ebering, 1923.

THIS dissertation, which contains (i.) a Latin introduction dealing summarily with the palaeography of *P. Oxy.* VI. 852, the form of the *Hypsipyle* story followed by Euripides, the date of the play and its modern bibliography; (ii.) the text of the chief fragments, accompanied by critical and exegetical notes; and (iii.) three Latin excursuses concerning the prologue, the rôles of Euneus and Thoas, and the problems connected with a line on p. 50 (64 ii. 93), is a useful résumé of the work done on the *Hypsipyle*, to which it adds something of its own. But it is clear that, apart from the discovery of new material, the only prospect of advancing from hypotheses to certainties now lies in a renewed intensive examination of the papyrus with a view to combining more of the unplaced fragments and determining their positions in the roll. This will be a tedious and may be an unprofitable business, and the editor has not undertaken it. Yet that something may yet remain to be done is made probable by the facts that Professor Hunt in his second edition succeeded in placing fragments 5 and 65, that Petersen's identification of *P. Petr.* II. 49c made it possible to assign fr. 22 to its proper position, and that the present editor himself has correctly joined fr. 75 to fr. iv. (where read *ἐνοσα*, perhaps *ἐξουσα*, not *ἐ[]σουσαι*, p. 21). I may add that fragments 70 and 96 also join (*ἄλλ' ἀγαγῶν | ὅς' ἐμ' ἐπ' ἡγήσθων | ὅς' ἐμ' ἐπ' ἡγήσθων*, the first *ξ* corrected).

The sober-minded will approve the editor's judgment in relegating guesses for the most part to the bottom of the text. They would still more have approved the omission of a great many of them. For if it is useless to print, *exempli gratia*, both Bury's *ἡ Δημία χθών ὕψιπύλην ἐθρενέ με* and von Arnim's *ἡ Δημία χθών, παῖς ὅς' (sic) ἦν, ἐθρενέ με* (p. 16), it is still more useless to print, even for the pleasure of adding 'vitiouse,' Herwerden's *Δηκούργος αὐτὸς ἐκδημῶν τανῶν κυρεῖ* (p. 6). But the editor is somewhat charitable to the outcasts of metre, as is shown by his reading in the text *σφῶν δὲ δὴ σὺ τέκνα, σφῶ δὲ μητέρα*, and defending it in a curious note (p. 48). The explanatory notes, also, while they contain some useful matter in the way of discussion of the course of the drama, follow the peculiar modern fashion of adducing illustrations which do not illustrate. At least, it may be doubted whether *θεῶν τις ὡς ἀπληστος ἦν* is made much more intelligible by a comparison with *ἐλπίς ἀπληστος*, *I.T.* 415 (p. 49).

Nevertheless, in spite of the presence of some things that one would wish away, this is a decent and serviceable, if not an indispensable, piece of work, which it may be hoped Mr. Italie himself will some day supersede.

E. LOBEL.

Palaeografia Latina Diplomatica e Nozioni di Scienze Ausiliarie. NICOLA BARONE. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". One vol., with atlas, 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 352. 40 small cuts in text, 28 plates in atlas. Napoli: Rondinella e Loffredo, *Biblioteca di MOYSEION*, Vol. I., 1923. Lire 40.

THIS book gives 128 pages to Palaeography, including everything to do with *Schriftwesen*, 120 to Diplomatic, 50 to Chronology, Sphragistic, and to an account of money, weights, and measures in the Two Sicilies; the transcription of the facsimiles takes the last 50 pages. It is evidently intended to supplement the author's lectures in the University of Naples. Even for this purpose the account of the history of Latin writing is very meagre; to Classical students it would not supply anything like enough information. The Diplomatic Section is much better, as to it 26 of the facsimiles are allotted; most of these are taken from the records of Southern Italy. A historian with some general knowledge of Diplomatic who wanted to make himself acquainted with the documents of the Two Sicilies would find this book a convenient introduction, but to the ordinary palaeographer it would offer little interest in any but the earlier specimens, which illustrate the cursive background upon which the Beneventan Script stood out as an artistic book-hand. The bibliographical references to Italian works might be useful; those to foreign books are very incomplete. There are a good many misprints.

E. H. MINNS.

The Claim of Antiquity, with an Annotated List of Books for those who know neither Latin nor Greek. Pp. 30. Oxford University Press, 1922. 1s.

THE Councils of the three great classical bodies are to be congratulated and thanked for officially recognising the needs of those who are unacquainted with the ancient tongues. The material at their disposal was abundant; the writers of Greece and Rome are available in good translations, several of which have become classics themselves; with the exception of Hebrew, there is no other literature, ancient or modern, which can be adequately studied in English versions.

There is not a single item in the Greek list which one would care to see omitted, but a few more entries would greatly help those for whom the booklet is intended. The editors were quite justified in omitting Pindar and Bacchylides, as little can be gleaned from these in an English dress. But why leave out the *Hellenica* and Arrian's *Anabasis*? Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Arrian, and Plutarch, provide a course of Greek History from our best authorities. The *Hellenica* is certainly not great history, and Xenophon committed an act of criminal folly when he set himself to continue the masterpiece of his predecessor. But at any rate his book is a continuous and contemporary account of a period covering fifty years, and it is full of 'good things.' Arrian again is racy and interesting, and he gives us a clear account of Alexander's cam-

paigns from a first-rate source. I would suggest the following additions to the list. P. 8, J. T. Sheppard, *The Pattern of the Iliad* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.); p. 10, H. G. Dakyns, *Hellenica, Oeconomicus* (Macmillan, 12s. 6d.); p. 12, J. F. Dobson, *The Greek Orators* (Methuen, 8s.); A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Demosthenes* (*Heroes of the Nations*, 10s. 6d.); A. S. Way, *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Dent's *Temple Classics*); E. J. Chinnock, Arrian's *Anabasis* (Bohn Library, 6s.); *The Characters of Theophrastus*, translated by Healey, with Earle's *Microcosmographie* (*Temple Classics*); p. 14, J. Baikie, *The Sea-Kings of Crete* (A. and C. Black, 7s. 6d. in 1910); G. W. Botsford, (a) *A History of Greece*, 1899 (Macmillan, now 9s.), an excellent book, too little known in this country; (b) his *Hellenic History* (Macmillan, 18s.) includes the Cretan discoveries which were not dealt with in (a); Thallon, *Readings in Greek History* (Ginn, 17s. 6d.), contains long extracts from Homer, the dramatists, orators, historians, etc., which I have found useful for Greekless students attending lectures on the History of Greece. *The Treatise on the Sublime* once won many readers when published in Cassell's *National Library* at 3d.; there are translations of it by Havell (Macmillan, 5s.) and Prickard (Oxford University Press, 6s.).

T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS.

Sketches from a Library Window. By BASIL ANDERTON, M.A. Pp. 182. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1922.

THIS book, by the City Librarian of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, consists in some eight essays, of which the first two, dealing with Justus Lipsius, and the fourth, entitled *The Lure of Translation*, most nearly concern the classical reader. They are all quite admirably written, in exact, pure, and sober English, which it is a pleasure to read. Having said so much, I feel that I must add the warning that the unlearned reader may not find Mr. Anderton a very exhilarating writer. This is largely due to Mr. Anderton's own modesty and choice of subjects. Thus he translates the most interesting part of the *de constantia*. It could not be done better, but nothing can make the *de constantia* anything but rather dull. A *réchauffé* of Stoicism in imitative Latin is fated to dullness, even if Lipsius be the author. There follows an excellent account of Lipsius himself. But there again one must admit that the man, like so many of these great early scholars, looks to us (unfairly enough, we may presume) a good deal of a pedant. This is scarcely a reflection upon Lipsius, since it is the fate of the scholar that his work survives while he himself is forgotten. It is the injustice of the world, but he is content.

The essay on translation is a little formless, and is perhaps overloaded with quotations. Indeed, the essays on classical subjects make less appeal to me on the whole than such as those on Wordsworth (*Nature and Human*

Nature) and Sir Thomas Browne. (This last paper seems to make a real contribution to the subject of prose rhythm.) Not but what Mr. Anderton is sensible enough on the question of verse translation. He sees the absurdity of legislating for all future translators. 'Translators, being artists in language, act like other artists' (p. 58). Just so; and therefore we ought to let them alone. We really cannot help them with our advice.

On p. 55 *damna tuum* has become *damnatum* in the printing, and Mr. Shewan is called Mr. Sherman on p. 51. Otherwise, unless it be for a French accent on p. 1, this book must be pretty nearly *sine errore*.

J. A. K. THOMSON.

The Pyrrhic Accent and Rhythm of Latin and Celtic. By THOMAS FITZHUGH, Professor of Latin in the University of Virginia. Pp. 24. Virginia Alumni Bulletin, April, 1923.

IN this pamphlet, in which he resumes a theory already maintained by him in a long series of publications, Professor Fitzhugh claims to 'have resurrected a new Latin speech and a new Latin verse . . . and the beauty and mastery of the one is, as elsewhere in the God-given realm of the Logos, the beauty and mastery of the other.' Put briefly, his theory is that when Ennius or Virgil, Catullus or Horace, thought they were writing in the metre of Homer or Sappho they were deceiving themselves; 'in every breath and line' they were using the accent and rhythm inherited by the Latin language from the period of 'Italo-Celtic unity,' and that without knowing it. It is doubtless perfectly true that the graecising fashion in Latin verse did not go very deep. The emergence after two or three centuries of eclipse of what seem to be accentual, not quantitative, metres indicates that the heart of the country remained sound. For Professor Fitzhugh's argument it, perhaps, proves too much. It may also be conceded to Professor

Fitzhugh that the acoustic effect of hexameters read by a Roman and by a Greek would be very different. But beyond that it seems unsafe to go, and the details of Professor Fitzhugh's theory have really nothing to support them. The introduction into the argument of the hypothesis of an Italo-Celtic unity involving common principles of metre appears to be based on a misunderstanding of the terminology of linguistic science. The examples of Irish verse which Professor Fitzhugh produces to illustrate the theory merely prove that he should carefully avoid the subject. His explanation of *triumpe* as 'O Three Foot' has an interest of its own.

J. FRASER.

The Sacred Dance. A Study in Comparative Folklore. By W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D. One vol. Pp. x+234. Cambridge University Press, 1923. 8s. 6d.

DR. OESTERLEY is primarily an Old Testament scholar. His knowledge of classical dances, which play a subsidiary part in his treatise, is evidently based upon secondary authorities. These, however, are in the main well chosen, though he would have found material, which he has missed, if his attention had been drawn to works dealing with the detail of Greek ritual, such as those of Stengel and Eitrem. Sir William Ridgeway's work upon dramatic dances, and, perhaps fortunately, the knotty problem of the origin of Greek tragedy, are not discussed. Our author's belief that the Dionysiac dance was Oriental and came from Syria must be due to misunderstanding. Most of his information, however, on classical subjects is correct, as far as it goes, and the book as a whole is a sound piece of honest work, which is clearly and sensibly, if a little aridly, set out. To students of classical religion it may provide a convenient summary of some interesting comparative data.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK). (1923.)

HISTORY.—November 12. Tenney Frank, *A History of Rome* [New York, 1923] (W. W. Hyde). Highly praised as an almost ideal textbook for college use: it covers the history to 476 A.D. in 613 pp. H. criticises individual views, and speaks of F.'s 'economic bias': his treatment is generally conservative and his style clear.

LITERATURE.—October 15. T. W. Allen, *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships* [Oxford and New York, 1921] (A. Shewan). S. strongly and at length supports A.'s view of the authenticity of the Catalogue against Leaf.—October 22. J. D. Bickford, *Soliloquy in Ancient Comedy* [Princeton, 1922] (A. L.

Wheeler). A good and useful doctorate dissertation.—October 29. D. R. Lee, *Child-life, Adolescence, and Marriage in Greek New Comedy and in Plautus* [Menasha, Wisconsin, 1919] (A. L. Wheeler). Long review, generally unfavourable.—November 19. A. Gudeman, *Aristoteles über die Dichtkunst, neu übersetzt* [Leipzig, 1921] (L. Cooper). Shows great fidelity to the Greek, yet is natural idiomatic German: makes more use than Bywater of the Arabic version in constituting the text.

PHILOSOPHY.—October 22. W. H. Heidel, *Anaximander's Book, the earliest known Geographical Treatise* [Boston, 1921: reprinted from Proceedings of American Academy of Arts and Sciences] (W. W. Hyde). A critical and exhaustive study.—November 19. W.

Veazie, *Empedocles' Psychological Doctrine* [New York, 1922] (R. B. English). Seeks to disentangle Emp.'s real views from the misunderstandings of Aristotle and later writers.

RELIGION.—November 5. J. C. Murley, *The Cults of Cisalpine Gaul as seen in the Inscriptions* [Menasha, Wisconsin, 1922] (J. W. Hewitt). A well-written dissertation for the Chicago doctorate, with an adequate bibliography.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR DAS KLAS-
SISCHE ALTERTUM, ETC.

(LI./LII. 4, 1923.)

C. W. Blegen, *Korakou, a Prehistoric Settlement near Corinth* [Boston and New York, 1921] (F. Studniczka). G. Rodenwaldt, *Der Fries des Megarons von Mykenai* [Halle a. S., 1921] (F. Studniczka). Both books are described at length and warmly praised, but in each various conclusions are disputed.—U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros* [Berlin, 1922] (E. Bethe). The substance is warmly praised, but the arrangement and obscurity are criticised. Bethe disagrees with various points, especially with W.'s belief in Pindar's noble birth.—B. Schweitzer, *Herakles* [Tübingen, 1922] (E. Bethe). Worthless.—Tenney Frank, *Vergil, a Biography* [New York, 1922] (R. Heinze). F.'s hypotheses are bold and novel, but mostly untenable. Heinze denies that *Ciris*, *Culex*, and *Aetna* can possibly be by one poet, and he does not believe that any of the three is by Vergil. F. grossly overrates Vergil's debt to Epicureanism, and underrates that to Stoicism.

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER, 1923.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—N. Wecklein, *Textkritische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern* [SB. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., München, 1921. Pp. 104] (Busche). First part contains survey of method and principles of textual criticism; in second part W. first discusses the MSS. and then adds his own emendations. Reviewer doubts if many of latter will find general acceptance.—*Theophrasti Characteres*. Ed. O. Immisch [Leipzig, 1923, Teubner. Pp. vi+45.] (Holland). Characteristically reliable, concise, and finished work; supplies long-felt need in Bibl. Teubneriana. Reviewer raises hope of annotated edition to follow.

LATIN LITERATURE.—K. Witte, *Horaz und Vergil* [Erlangen, 1922. Pp. 32] (Aly). Tries to prove from structure of 2nd and 16th Epodes that Horace is following Vergil.—J. C. Austin, *The significant Name in Terence* [Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. vii. 4. Urbana, 1921, Univ. of Illinois Press. Pp. 130] (Wüst). Deserves notice as an attempt in a very difficult field;

could be improved by re-arrangement of material. Reviewer points out some weaknesses.—*Catulli Veronensis liber*. Rec. E. T. Merrill [Leipzig, 1923, Teubner. Pp. viii+92.] (Hosius). On the whole satisfactory text; very brief introduction.—A. Gudeman, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur. I. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende der Republik* [Sammlung Göschen. Berlin, 1923, de Gruyter. Pp. 108] (A. Klotz). Superficial and unreliable.

HISTORY.—F. B. Marsh, *The Founding of the Roman Empire* [Univ. of Texas Press, 1922. Pp. vii+329] (Gelzer). Deals with Pompey, the Triumvirate, Caesar, and political work of Augustus; written with sound appreciation of facts.—U. Kahrstedt, *Griechisches Staatsrecht. I. Sparta und seine Symmachie. Mit vier Exkursen über den kretischen Staat, das korinthische Kolonialreich, das Wesen des archaischen Staates, die Amphiktyonie von Delphoi* [Göttingen, 1922, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht] (Bilabel). All the sources have been examined with splendid results; K. raises new questions and gives stimulating answers. Reviewer severely criticises faulty style, bad misprints, etc.

LANGUAGE.—W. A. Baehrens, *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi* [Halle, 1922. Pp. 130] (A. Klotz). Main value of B.'s work lies in his discussion of Vulgar Latin accent, phonology, morphology, and word-formation; rich collection of material, but no index.—E. Hofmann, *Qua ratione εἶπος, μῦθος, αἶσος, λόγος et vocabula ab eisdem stirpibus derivata in antiquo Græcorum sermone adhibita sint* [Göttinger Preisarbeit und Dissertation, 1922. Pp. iv+123] (Toedt-mann). A model of semasiological research; H. has finally settled the history of *μῦθος* and *εἶπος*, but reviewer is not in complete agreement about *αἶσος* and *λόγος*.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND ART.—E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen. 3 Bände* [München, Bruckmann. Pp. 918 and 805 illustrations on 361 plates] (Karo). Monumental work covering whole field of Greek painting, except Minoan art and Roman wall decoration; admirably illustrated. Reviewer praises lucid and critical handling of material.—P. Steiner, *Die Villa von Bollendorf* [Trier, 1922, Linz. Pp. 59 with 2 plates and 34 illustrations] (G. Wolff). Contains important modification of accepted views on one type of Roman villa in Germany.—F. Studniczka, *Die Ostgiebelgruppe vom Zeustempel in Olympia angeordnet und gedeutet* [Abh. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss., Leipzig, 1923. Four figures and one double plate] (Pfuhl). Important essay in regrouping of figures in East Pediment at Olympia. Reviewer discusses and criticises in detail.—H. Schaal, *Griechische Vasen aus Frankfurter Sammlungen* [Frankfurt a. M., 1923, Frankfurter Verlagsanstalt. Pp. 80 and 60 plates] (Langlotz). Valuable for illustrations rather than text. Reviewer contributes informing discussion.

CORRESPONDENCE

PROSODIA LATINA.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,

Perhaps the best acknowledgement of the kindness of my friend Professor Sonnenschein's review¹ is to respond to his suggestion that I should explain myself further on a point of detail, not indeed cardinal in itself but involving what is cardinal. I had said in § 47 of my book that *-mat* [as in *amat*] is a syllable only before a following consonant or at the end of a sentence or verse. These words were not intended for a positive and formal statement of the rules which govern the distribution and, by consequence, the scansion of the final sounds of words whereof *amat* is taken as a specimen, but as a general caution to the student respecting the practice of Latin speech as a whole, both in prose and in verse. In the first of the three cases ('before a following consonant') prose and verse were regarded, in the second, speaking generally, prose only, and in the third of course verse alone. I thank Professor Sonnenschein for pointing out the insufficiency of the statement, which, when occasion offers, I will endeavour to mend. On the actual question which he raises I can admit no doubt. Quoting *Aen.* iv. 238 *Dixerat. Ille patres*, etc., and *Aen.* xi. 709 *Dixit: at ille furens*, etc., he asks how are we to scan these lines, for the pause at the end of the first sentence makes it impossible to pronounce *Dixerat-Ille* or *Dixi-at*. He thus denies liaison of a consonant at the end of a sentence, assuming that a sentence in verse must end with the last sound of its final word, and that it is after the completed word that the sentence pause will come. There is, however, another liaison which clamours for attention—the liaison of vowels or 'elision,' of which I treat in the next following page. The Roman poets might easily have avoided elision at the end of a sentence, had they chosen; but they did not choose. For examples take *Georg.* i. 100 f. *Vmida solstitia atque hiemes orate serenas* | *Agricolae: hiberno laetissima pulvere farra*, ib. ii. 17 ff. *Pullulat ab radice aliis densissima silua* | *Vt cerasis ulmisque; etiam Parnasia laurus* | *Parua sub ingenti matris se subicit umbra*. Here the sentence pause cannot

come after the last sound of the final word (*agricolae, ulmisque*); for this would give not elision but hiatus. Either, then, there was no pause between the sentences, and the value of the sentence pause as an argument for pronunciation and scansion disappears; or the sentence pause was in the unelided portion of the word, being, for example, either (a) *agrico-* or (b) *agricol-*. If Professor Sonnenschein elects for (a), why should *dixera-* shock him when *agrico-* does not? If for (b), he must explain why the *l* was so upset by the elision that, deserting its partner and forgetting the established principles of Latin word-division (*agri-co-lae*), it backed into the preceding syllable, and in the second example how *qu(e)* can be pronounced with its sentence without producing a final combination of sounds which even if pronounceable, is completely alien to the Latin tongue. Failing such explanations, the unbiased reader will conclude that in the liaison of vowels the punctuation of a verse is immaterial to its scansion, and will ask to be told why it should be material in the liaison of consonants. In this connexion he will bethink himself that ancient verse forms were indifferent not only to stops but, what to us is much more disconcerting, changes of speakers, and that he has only to turn a page or two of Plautus to discover that division of a line between two interlocutors is (as at *Amph.* 307) no obstacle to liaison between their speeches, and that Vergil does not shrink from elision at the end of sentence, verse and speech in one, *Aen.* iv. 629 '*pugnent ipsique nepotesque*.' | *Haec ait*.

With other important questions raised by Professor Sonnenschein, especially in their bearing on the proper teaching of the Latin classics in our schools and universities, I hope to have another opportunity of dealing. But I feel that I ought at once to protest against the suggestion that I regard the metre of Myers' *St. Paul* as 'ignoble.' The metre so stigmatised in '§ 323 p. 114,' is the measure commonly called the English sapphic, ridiculed by Canning in the *Anti Jacobin*, from which I then quote a stanza. And may I ask readers of my book to correct two oversights affecting numbers that may cause trouble? In § 319 (end) 'Fourth' should be 'Fifth' and in § 348 'three feet' should be 'two feet.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹ See C.R., Vol. XXXVII. (1922), p. 125.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Billson (C. J.) The Aeneid of Virgil, translated by C. J. B. New and revised edition. Pp. viii + 365. Oxford: Blackwell, 1923. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Buckler (W. H.) and Calder (W. M.) Anatolian

Studies presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay. Edited by W. H. B. and W. M. C. Pp. xxxviii + 479. 14 plates. Manchester: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 36s. net.

Carnoy (A.) Manuel de Linguistique Grecque.

- Les sons, les formes, le style. Pp. 426. Louvain : Éditions Universitatis ; Paris : E. Champion, 1924. Paper.
- Classical Philology*. Vol. XVIII., No. 4. October, 1923.
- Cocchia* (E.) Saggi Glottologici: contributo allo studio del latino arcaico. Pp. vii + 365. (Biblioteca di MOYSEION, Vol. IV.) Naples: Rondinella and Loffredo, 1924. Stiff paper, 35 lire.
- Croiset* (A.) Platon, Tome III., 2^e partie. Gorgias, Ménon. Texte établi et traduit par A. C. avec la collaboration de L. Bodin. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. Paper.
- Diès* (A.) Platon, Tome VIII., 1^{re} partie. Parménide. Texte établi et traduit par A. D. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. Paper, 9 francs.
- Doherty* (F. C.) The Martyrdom of Socrates. The Apologia and Crito, with selections from Phaedo, partly in the original and partly in translation. Edited by F. C. D. Pp. 112. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Goelzer* (H.) Tacite, Annales, Livres I.-III. Texte établi et traduit par H. G. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. Paper, 16 francs.
- Guillemin* (A.-M.) Cornélius Népos. Texte établi et traduit par A.-M. G. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. Paper, 16 francs.
- Gyomlay* (J.) Epilegomena ad Homerum, sive observationes ad elocutionem et compositionem Iliadis et ad quaestionem Homericam. Pp. 54. Budapest: Franklin-Társulat Nyomdaja, 1923. Paper.
- Hadow* (W. H.) Citizenship. Pp. xi + 240. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Hallam* (G. H.) Horace at Tibur and the Sabine Farm. With illustrations and maps. Pp. 24. Harrow: School Bookshop, 1923. Boards.
- Johnson* (A. F.) Francisci Petrarachi Epistolae Selectae. Edidit A. F. J. Pp. x + 276. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth.
- Koch* (K.) Galeni de sanitate tuenda, de alimentorum facultatibus, de bonis malisque sucis, de victu attenuante, de ptisana; ediderunt K. K., G. Helmreich, C. Kalbfleisch, O. Hartlich. Pp. lxxiv + 522. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, V 4, 2.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1923. Paper, about 3.66 shillings.
- Lawton* (W. C.) The Soul of the Anthology. Pp. xii + 179. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1923. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Leaf* (W.) Strabo on the Troad: Book XIII., Chapter I., edited with translation and commentary by W. L. Pp. xlviii + 352. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Montgomery* (M.) Friedrich Hölderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement. Pp. viii + 232. Oxford: University Press, 1923. Paper, 10s. 6d. net; cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Norwood* (G.) The Art of Terence. Pp. 156. Oxford: Blackwell, 1923. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Oman* (J.) Book of Revelation: theory of the text: re-arranged text and translation: commentary. Pp. xi + 168. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Pease* (A. S.) M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione liber secundus. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. VIII., No. 2, pp. 341-462.) Urbana, 1923. \$1.50.
- Philosophical Essays presented to John Watson*. Pp. 346. Published by Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. Cloth, \$1.50 post free.
- Richier* (Gisela M. A.) The Craft of Athenian Pottery. An investigation of the technique of black-figured and red-figured Athenian vases. Pp. 113; 89 illustrations. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1923. Boards, 25s. net.
- Ross* (W. D.) Aristotle. Pp. vii + 300. London: Methuen, 1923. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Vol. I., fasc. 1. Pp. 68. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1923. Paper.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 1922. Vol. LIII. Pp. 197 + lxxxv. Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio. Paper.
- Vial* (F. G.) Three Measures of Meal. A study in religion. Pp. xxxii + 342. Oxford: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Walker* (R. J.) Addenda Scenica, being a treatment (supplementary to Nauck's) of the fragments of the Tragic Minores Graeci, together with various discussions relating to Greek Tragedy, Satyric Drama, and Comedy. Pp. xii + 611. Paris: Éditions Ernest Leroux, 1923. Paper.
- Walters* (R. C. S.) Greek and Roman Engineering Instruments. Pp. 16. (Excerpt Transactions of the Newcomen Society. Vol. II, 1921-1922).
- Waltz* (R.) Sénèque. Dialogues. Tome 3^e: Consolations. Texte établi et traduit par R. W. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923. Paper, 14 francs.
- Wells* (J.) Studies in Herodotus. Pp. viii + 232. Oxford: Blackwell, 1923. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Wylie* (J. K.) Solidarity and Correality. Pp. xvi + 365. (Studies in Roman Law, No. 1.) Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1923. Cloth, 18s. net.

25s.

and
Pp.
1923.

156.
net.
f the
com-
Uni-

vina-
inois
Vol.
1923.

atson.
rsity,
ee.

enian
nique
enian
New
don:

don:

ol. I.,
1923.

frican
LIII.
leve-

l. A
ford:
net.

ng a
of the
raeci,
ng to
medy.
rnest

neer-
rans-
l. II.,

e 3°:
t par
Belles

+232.
l. net.

Pp.
o. I.)
Cloth,